BIBLICAL HERMENEUTICS

SCHODDE

Morris & Watkins

LUTHERAN BIBLE TRANSLATORS
Messengers of Christ, Inc.
P.O. Box 885 Orange, Calif. 92669

BS 476 .S3
Schodde, George Henry, 1854-
Outlines of Biblical
hermeneutics

WILLIAM CAREY INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY
LATOURETTE LIBRARY
1539 Howard St.
Pasadena, CA 91104

DEMCO

BS
476
S3

OUTLINES
OF
BIBLICAL HERMENEUTICS

A Handbook for Students of the Word

BY
GEORGE H. SCHODDE, Ph. D., D. D.
Professor of Theology, Ev. Lutheran Seminary, Capital University, Columbus, Ohio

Columbus, Ohio
Lutheran Book Concern
1917

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

The author of this handbook, Dr. Schodde, was called to his eternal rest while the book was in press. The original copy was typed and submitted to him for examination, but his physical condition then already precluded any careful revision. He had already departed this life when the proof pages came off the press and these, therefore, had to be read by other persons. A few changes in construction, etc., were also made.

THE PUBLISHERS.

Property of
Latourette Library
WCIU

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

THE leading purpose of this volume is to bring Bible facts to bear on Bible interpretation. Other works on Hermeneutics have not been ignored, but still the main object has been to have the Bible interpret itself; and the only regret is that relatively so small a portion of the rich storehouse of Bible truths could be utilized. The writer, while adhering strictly to the old historic principles of the Lutheran Church, is yet convinced that even now the Holy Spirit is still operative in the church and has taught the people of our times also some new things concerning that deepest of all deep books—the Holy Scriptures.

Technical theological terms and quotations from the original tongues have been avoided as much as possible so that not only the trained pastor but all intelligent Bible students may be able to use this book.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

The Bible as the Object of Interpretation

			PAGE
CHAPTER	I.	The Bible as Literature	9
CHAPTER	II.	The Bible as to Its Purpose and Contents.	59
CHAPTER	III.	The Divine and the Human Factors in the Scriptures	121

PART II

The General Principles of Hermeneutics

CHAPTER	I.	The Sense of the Author	137
CHAPTER	II.	The Original Languages	154
CHAPTER	III.	The Context	180

PART III

Special Hermeneutics

CHAPTER	I.	Fundamental Principle	189
CHAPTER	II.	Analogy of the Scriptures and of Faith..	192
CHAPTER	III.	Reason in Interpretation	200
CHAPTER	IV.	Prophecy and Its Interpretation	206
CHAPTER	V.	Types	219
CHAPTER	VI.	Parables	222
CHAPTER	VII.	Old Testament Passages Quoted in the New Testament	230

PART I

THE BIBLE AS THE OBJECT OF INTERPRETATION

(7)

CHAPTER I

The Bible as Literature

1. Name. The word "Bible" is derived from the Greek *βίβλος*, a modification of *βύβλος*, a term designating the papyrus of Egypt, or rather, the inner bark of the papyrus, used among other purposes also as material upon which the ancients were accustomed to write. It is also a Biblical term, used, e.g., of books of the Old Testament (Matt. 1, 1; Mark 12, 24; Luke 3, 4; Acts 1, 20); figuratively also (Phil. 4, 3; Apoc. 3, 5, etc.); while the diminuative form *βιβλίον* is found in Luke 4, 17; John 20, 30; Gal. 3, 10; and in a modified sense in Matt. 19, 7; Mark 10, 4; Apoc. 13, 8; 17, 8; 20, 12; 21, 27, etc. The word "Bible," taken from *βιβλία* (Lat. *Biblia*), is thus plural, "books," or rather "small books," and designates the Scriptures as a collection of (small) books. The Greek Christians used the term *τὰ βιβλία* in the sense of "the Books," *par excellence,* which term appears as early as II Clemens (142 A. D.), one of the so-called Apostolic Fathers, who wrote about the middle of the second century. Later the name was generally qualified by such terms as "holy," "divine," "canonical." The Latin form Biblia was at a later period often regarded as a singular, with the genitive "Bibliae," probably under the growing conviction of the unity of the revelation of God found in these sixty-six different writings.

Another term "Bibliotheca," or "Library," found first in Jerome and other Fathers, was currently em-

ployed in the Middle Ages as a name for the Scriptures; hence the paranomasia "habeo bibliothecam in mea bibliotheca" was often employed. Among the Latins, too, qualifying terms, such as "divina," were at first employed but were soon discontinued.

The terms employed in the Old Testament and in the Apocrypha for the Jewish Scriptures, or parts of them, are such as "the books" (Dan. 9, 2); "the holy books" (I Macc. 12, 9); "the book of the Law" (I Macc. 1, 56; 3, 48); "the book of the Testament" (I Macc. 1, 57). In the New Testament the usual term for the Old Testament is *αἱ γραφαί*, the (sacred) writings (Matt. 21, 42; 22, 29; Luke 24, 32; John 5, 39; Acts 18, 24); but when the singular (*ἡ γραφή*) is used, as in Luke 4, 21; John 20, 9; James 2, 8, it may refer to a special passage, or as in II Tim. 3, 16, to the entire Old Testament. Occasionally the adjective *ἁγίαι* is added (Rom. 1, 2), or the synonymous term *τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα* is used, II Tim. 3, 15. In Luke 24, 44 the terms for the three divisions of the Hebrew Canon are employed; viz., "the Law," "the Prophets," "the Psalms" (cf. Ecclus. 1, 1), occasionally "the Law and the Prophets" (Acts 28, 23; Matt. 5, 17), or merely "the Law" (John 12, 34, and perhaps Matt. 5, 18).

The term "Testament," as the name for one or the other of the two great divisions of the Bible, is Biblical in origin. The expression, *διαθήκη*, used by Christ, but not in any literary sense, in Matt. 26, 28; Mark 14, 24; Luke 22, 20; I Cor. 11, 25, originally meant "arrangement," or "disposition," but later also "will," or "testament." In the Septuagint it is employed as a translation of בְּרִית, or covenant; and Paul in II Cor. 3, 14 speaks of the Hebrew Scriptures read in the Synagogues

as "the Old Covenant," and of the ministers of Christ as "Ministers of the New Covenant" (II Cor. 3, 6).

In the Latin the term "testamentum" or "instrumentum" was employed. The latter was a favorite in the African church as reported by Tertullian; but the term "testamentum" in the Vulgate made this the popular name for the Scriptures in Latin, which, however, also employed both the singular "Scriptura" and the plural "Scripturae," but more frequently the former. The term "instrumentum" in a literary sense is also classical Latin (e. g., Quintillian, 12, 8. 12). In the English the plural "Scriptures" is more general while the Germans use only the singular "Die Schrift."

2. The Bible a Collection of Books. As indicated by the name, the Bible, as far as its form and composition are concerned, is not one book but a collection of books—a library. It consists of sixty-six different writings, thirty-nine of these constituting the Old Testament Canon and twenty-seven the New Testament Canon. In bulk the former takes up almost exactly three-fourths of the contents of the Bible and the latter one-fourth. Such exceptionally long books of the Old Testament as the Psalms, with one hundred and fifty lyrics; Isaiah, with sixty-six chapters; Jeremiah, with fifty-two; Genesis, with fifty; Ezekiel, with forty-eight; Job, with forty-two, cannot be duplicated in the New Testament, in which Matthew, with twenty-eight chapters; Acts with the same number; Luke, with twenty-four; John, with twenty-one, are the longest. Without counting the Epistle to the Hebrews, the thirteen letters of the Apostle Paul are together a little shorter than the two books contributed by his pupil, Luke. In the Old Testament there is but one book with a single chapter,

namely, Obadiah, while Haggai has two; Zephaniah, Habakkuk, and Nahum, each three; Joel, Jonah, Malachi, Ruth, each four. In the New Testament there are four books consisting of but one chapter each, namely, Philemon, II and III John, and Jude, while II Thessalonians, Titus, and II Peter have three each. The fourteen Old Testament Apocrypha added to Luther's translation are in bulk almost equal to the New Testament books.

The variety and types of literature represented in this collection are remarkable, as they embody biography, history, law, ritual, psalmody, dialogue—if not drama (Job; Song of Songs; Mal. 1, 2, 7, 14, 17; 3, 7, 8, 13)—proverbs, prophecy, apocalypse, and epistles. Several of these are again capable of subdivision. Thus Paul writes to individual congregations, as Romans, I Corinthians, Thessalonians; or circular letters, such as Galatians, II Corinthians, Ephesians (the words "in Ephesus," Eph. 1, 1, are not genuine), Colossians (Col. 4, 16); private letters to laymen, such as Philemon; or official instructions to his pupils in charge of congregations, namely, Timothy and Titus. Third John is also originally a private letter addressed to a certain Gaius (cf. vs. 1), while in Luke 1, 4 and Acts 1, 1 we are expressly informed that these historical books were written primarily for the instruction of one individual, namely, Theophilus.

3. The Old Testament Canon and the Apocrypha. According to the Jewish arrangement of the thirty-nine books composing the Old Testament Canon, these writings are regarded as a body of only twenty-four, or rather twenty-two books. The latter number is mentioned and explained by the Jewish historian Josephus

(Contra Apionem, chap. 1, 8), and is accepted also by the church father Origen.

This division regards the twelve Minor Prophets as one book; also Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, and Ezra-Nehemiah, each as a single book; and unites Ruth with Judges, and Lamentations with Jeremiah. This would reduce the number of separate books by seventeen and the result would be twenty-two canonical writings, in harmony with the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet. The older number of twenty-four still regards Ruth and Lamentations as separate books and is found in the Talmud and the Midrash.

This list does not include the Old Testament Apocrypha, which are found in the Septuagint to the number of seventeen, yet not as a separate group of writings but mixed with the canonical, all of which, with the exception of III Maccabees, the Epistle of Jeremiah and I Ezra, were by Luther added to his translation of the Old Testament with the declaration that these books are not to be regarded as equal to the Sacred Scriptures, but are nevertheless useful and good to read. This judgment can be approved only when restricted to the books of Ecclesiasticus (Jesus Sirach), the Wisdom of Solomon, and I Maccabees, the first two of considerable religious and the third of historical value, while the other books, such as Tobit, II Maccabees, Judith, etc., are full of fiction, fable, and error. There is, however, no perfect agreement in the Septuagint and the Vulgate manuscripts as to the books that belong to the Apocrypha, and, as a rule, the canonical and the apocryphal books are found strangely combined and mixed. Thus in the Leander Van Ess edition of the Septuagint, published by papal authority, and on the

basis of the Vatican Codex (1823 A. D.), Tobit and Judith are found next to Nehemiah, the Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclesiasticus next after the Song of Songs, the Epistles of Jeremiah and Baruch next after Jeremiah, and the three books of Maccabees after Daniel, while the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Youths constitute an appendix to the third chapter of Daniel, and the Story of Susanna forms an introductory chapter to this same book, and the story of Bel an appendix also to this book.

4. The Apocrypha Question. These apocryphal books were never regarded as a part and portion of the Old Testament Canon, neither by the Jewish church nor officially by any larger section of the Christian church, until the Council of Trent in 1546 (Session IV, 1) adopted them as belonging to the Canon of the Roman Catholic Church; and in this list not even all the Apocrypha are included, but only Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, and the two books of the Maccabees. See Chemnitz, *Examen,* Berlin, 1861, p. 51. It is in fact incorrect to speak of a "Greek" Canon of the Old Testament at all in contrast to the only collection of books that constituted the Jewish Canon, sometimes termed the "Hebrew Canon," as is evidenced by the fact that the Jews without exception adopted only that collection known as the Canonical books. In this they were followed by Christ and the New Testament, as is seen from the noteworthy fact that among the several hundred of quotations from and references to the Old Testament found in the New, there is not as much as even an indirect allusion to the Apocryphal Books, although the New Testament does mention and accept as historically correct data that could possibly be known

only from living tradition, such as the names of Jannes and Jambres, as the Egyptian sorcerers who opposed Moses, in II Tim. 3, 8 (Ex. 7, 11. sqq.), which names are indeed found not infrequently in various forms in later Jewish literature, but not in the Old Testament or in Josephus; and they also refer to matters evidently handed down by Jewish traditions and handled in special Apocalypses, namely, the struggle between the Archangel Michael and Satan for the body of Moses in Jude 9 sqq. (the theme of the book known as the "Assumptio Mosis"), and the prophecy of Enoch, in Jude 14 sqq. (found in almost identical words in the Book of Enoch, chap. 1, 9—the similarity to be explained not as the citing of one book by the other, but by the fixed tradition handed down in Israel). The Septuagint translation, furnished at the request of the Egyptian King Philadelphus for the Alexandrian library, was doubtlessly never intended to be a collection of Jewish official religious writings, but a chrestomathy of Jewish literature in general, and hence not a religious but a literary work. To speak of a "Greek" Canon is accordingly a misnomer. The Septuagint translation found its way into the early Christian literature, partly because it had evidently been the "Bible of the New Testament writers," although these latter had corrected not a few of the mistranslations of the Septuagint, as, e. g., Is. 7, 14, and partly through the ignorance of the early Church Fathers, who not knowing Hebrew nor the Canon as accepted by the Jews, were not aware of the fact that all the books found in the Septuagint, which because of their ignorance they were compelled to use, were not received into the official Canon of the Jews, as this had been accepted and employed also by Christ and the New

Testament writers. Later when the controversies between the Christians and the Jews brought out the difference between the contents of the Hebrew and the Greek Old Testaments, Melito, Bishop of Sardis, in 172 A. D., and Origen (died 254 A. D.), the most learned of the Greek fathers, made clear inquiries of the Jews in Palestine concerning the Canon of the Old Testament and published official lists of this body of writings. In the fourth century the Synod of Laodicea (360 A. D.) officially promulgated this list and the reading of the Apocrypha was forbidden, although certain of the teachers of the Church, such as Athanasius, Amphilochius, and others, permitted the catechumens to read these writings.

In the Latin church the early translation, known as the "Itala," had been made from the Septuagint and regarded these Apocrypha as "Scripturae divinae"; and through the influence of Augustine at the Synods of Hippo (393 A. D.) and of Carthage (419 A. D.) these books were put on the level with the Canonical: but prominent Latin teachers, such as Beda, Alcuin, Rhebanus Maurus, and others rejected the Apocrypha. The Roman Catholic Church as such must hold to these books, as they contain the *sedes doctrinae* of some of the leading heresies of that church. Thus the doctrines of purgatory and of prayer for the dead — inwardly closely connected — are plainly taught in II Maccabees 12, 41-46, where we are told that Judas Maccabaeus caused his followers to send two thousand drachmas of silver to Jerusalem as an atonement offering for the dead; and vs. 44 expressly speaks of the prayer for the dead. In Tobit 4, 11-12, it is plainly taught that alms deliver from all sins and from death, and that they are

the greatest comfort in the presence of the Most High God. The same error is taught in Tob. 12, 9, where prayer and fasting are also declared to be meritorious.

These facts justify two conclusions from the standpoint of Hermeneutics, in regard to the Old Testament Apocrypha: namely, 1) These books are not the object of the interpreter's work as are the canonical; and 2) The contents of these books cannot be directly utilized for hermeneutical work, as, for instance, for the construction of the Analogy of the Scriptures on any subject as a means for Biblical interpretation. This does not mean that the Bible student cannot make good use of these books. On the contrary, he can. For instance, in the construction of the historical background of the New Testament, especially the explanation of the genesis and development of the errors of the decadent Jewish theology of Christ's time, such as their doctrine of justification by works, it is possible to trace this process largely in these writings as well as in that other body of inter-Testament books known as the Apocalypses, including such as the Book of Enoch, the Book of Jubilees, the Assumption of Moses, the Ascension of Isaiah, 4th Ezra, the Psalms of Solomon, which more clearly than all the others teaches the doctrine of justification by faith, while the Book of Enoch (chap. 46) makes repeated use of the term "Son of Man" as a name of the promised Messiah.

5. The New Testament Apocrypha. There are also a group of books, changeable as far as number is concerned, and known as New Testament Apocrypha; but none of these have ever been regarded as canonical, except occasionally by small branches of the church,

e. g., that of Ethiopia. Two of these, the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermes, are found even in the Codex Sinaiticus. These New Testament Apocrypha may be arranged under four heads: viz., 1) Pseudo-gospels, such as the Gospel to the Hebrews, the Gospel to the Egyptians, the Childhood Gospel of Christ, etc.; 2) Letters, such as the Epistle of Barnabas; 3) Doctrinal writings, such as the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles; 4) Apocalypse, such as that of Peter. Many or even most of these pseudo-apostolic books are outspoken advocates of heretical tendencies, as the Gospel to the Hebrews is an exponent of Judaistic Christianity; but Biblical Hermeneutics as a science has nothing to do with these directly. They are more valuable for the church historian than for the Bible student. In this respect, too, as in virtually all others, the New Testament Apocrypha are inferior in value to the Apocrypha of the Old Testament.

6. The Arrangement of the Contents of Biblical Books. In the arrangement of the contents of the Biblical books it often occurs that the chronological order is not observed, as little as this order is maintained in the arrangement of these books in the Canon, both of the Old and of the New Testament. Thus the inaugural vision of the prophet Isaiah is found chap. 6, 1 sqq. In each of the Major Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, there are found grouped a series of prophecies directed against the gentile nations and uttered when these in the ups and downs of Israel's history came into contact or conflict with the chosen people, and hence chronologically not belonging together (cf. Is. chaps. 14-27; Jer. chaps. 36-41; Ezek. chaps. 25-35). That the Psalms are not arranged in chronological order is ap-

parent already from the fact that the oldest in this collection, that of Moses, is the 90th in the collection. Ps. 72 is by Solomon, but there are later Davidic psalms (Pss. 108 and 110). In the Gospel of Matthew the arrangement of the materials is manifestly not the chronological, as this book practically begins with the Sermon on the Mount (chaps. 5-7), although this discourse belongs to the second year of Christ's public ministry and is correctly located by Luke (chap. 6, 20-49). Matthew has evidently placed it at the beginning of his book because of its special purpose, which was the instruction of the Jewish Christians; and the Sermon on the Mount aims first of all to show how far short of the divine ideals of the Law are the teachings of the Pharisaic orthodoxy of the New Testament period, which proposition was fundamental to the whole scheme of the Gospel. Matthew's arrangement is rather according to subject matter than according to time, while Luke, acording to his own statement (1, 4), intends to write καθεξῆς, i. e., chronologically. Only occasionally does Matthew seem to be more chronological than Luke, e. g., in the Temptation of Christ in Matt. 4, 1-11 as compared with Luke 4, 1-13, where Luke seems to give a kind of a geographical order of the events he records; and in the brief account given by Luke of the Lord's Supper (Luke 22, 19-20), which account would make the impression that this ordinance was established by Christ while Judas was still present, while a comparison, especially of John 13, 26-30 with the two Synoptics, Matt. 26, 23, sqq. and Mark 14, 20-21, shows that Judas had already departed when the Supper was instituted. The oldest of the Pauline Epistles are Thessalonians, and the four "cap-

tivity letters," namely, Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon which are not in chronological order.

7. Jewish Arrangement of the Canon. The Jews divided their Canon into three parts: first, the Torah, or Law, containing the Five Books of Moses; secondly, the Prophets, including both the Prophetae Priores, or Former Prophets, embracing the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings, called prophetical and not historical because they taught the ways of Jehovah rather by His deeds than by His words, and the Prophetae Posteriores, or Later Prophets, embracing the three literary prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel (but not Daniel, which belongs to the third division) and the twelve Minor Prophets from Hosea to Malachi; and, thirdly, "the (Sacred) Writings," (Kethubim) containing all the other books in the following order: Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles. Of these again the fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth are called the "Megilloth," or "rolls," because they were written on separate rolls (while the other books of both the Old and the New Testament generally appear in groups in the manuscripts, such as the Minor Prophets, the Torah, the Gospels, the Pauline Epistles), to be read on special anniversaries, e. g., Lamentations on the day of the destruction of Jerusalem and Esther on the Purim festival.

This division dates back to pre-Christian times. We see in the Prologue to the Apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus (chap. 1, 1), dating probably from the third century B. C., that the author divides the sacred books of the Jews into three classes, viz., the Law, the Prophets, and the Other Writers who succeeded these;

and in vs. 3, he speaks of the Law, the Prophets and the Other Books, referring doubtlessly to the Kethubim. In Josephus (Contra Apionem 1, 8) virtually, though not so clearly, these three classes of books are mentioned. In Luke 24, 44 this division into three parts is meant and the word "Psalms" is correctly understood as not referring to this one book but to the entire third division of the Canon, which opens with the Psalms. In this verse Christ wishes to say that the entire Old Testament testifies of Him. This arrangement, especially too that the book of Chronicles closes the Hebrew Canon, throws light on Matt. 23, 35, and Luke 11, 51. Reference is here made without a doubt to the event recorded in II Chron. 24, 21, near the close of the Hebrew Scriptures, so that the meaning would be that the blood of all the righteous that had been reported shed from the beginning to the close of the Old Testament Scriptures would be demanded from the generation contemporaneous with the Lord. The fact that in vs. 20 this Zechariah is called the Son of Jehoiada, the priest, may easily mean that he was the descendant of this well known man, just as Zechariah, one of the Minor Prophets, in Zech. 1, 1, is declared to have been the grandson of Iddo, while in Ezra 5, 1 and 6, 4 he is said to have been his son, the name of his father Berechiah being omitted, as this is frequently done in genealogies in Hebrew and can be seen by a comparison of the line of descent of Jesus in Matt. 1 and Luke 3.

That these books of the Old Testament are, in many cases, not in chronological order, is illustrated by the singular fact that the last two verses in the Hebrew Canon (II Chron. 36, 22-23) are repeated almost verbatim in the book of Ezra 1, 1-2, which fact is probably

the reason that in the Septuagint and in modern translations Ezra is placed directly after II Chronicles. There is no certainty that the Minor Prophets appear in chronological order, except that this is the case with the three from the post-exilic period, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. Of the other nine, all pre-exilic, Joel and Obadiah are probably the oldest, even older than the Major Prophets that precede them in the Old Testament Canon.

8. Arrangement of the New Testament Books. In the arrangement and order of the New Testament books there is the same diversity. The four gospels are found in all possible orders; the Catholic Epistles can possibly claim precedence of position even over the Pauline letters and are found between the Acts and the Epistles in some editions of the Greek, and in the classic German translation of Weizsäcker James comes directly after Acts; the Epistle of Hebrews is found either in connection with the Pauline or with the Catholic Epistles.

The Synoptic Gospels as a group — not of course John which is the last of the New Testament books — are later productions than are the letters as a group, which fact explains the singular phenomenon that while the epistles are really commentaries and interpretations of the fundamental soteriological facts of the gospels, these letters never give a single quotation from the gospels. This is true even of James 4, 17, where the similarity with Luke 12, 47 is but slight. It is even a more singular fact that the only statement of an apostle directly ascribed to Christ, namely, Acts 20, 35, where Paul says that "To give is more blessed than to receive" is a word of the Master, is not found in the gospels. It is what is called an *ἄγραφον*, i. e., a saying of Christ not

recorded in the gospels, of which there are several dozen scattered throughout early Patristic literature. Scholars have often claimed that in the epistles are other sayings of Christ, not given in the gospels and without mention being made of the source. The gospel facts were first transmitted by oral tradition in the churches and not in fixed literary forms, and the epistles expound and expand them while yet in the former condition; hence the lack of citations. In addition the historical priority of the epistles perhaps explains why the epistolary lessons are read in the churches before the gospel lessons, especially too because directions to have this done were given by the letter writers but not by the authors of the gospels (cf. I Thess. 5, 27; Col. 4, 16). The Apocalypse, for historical and philological reasons, is doubtless the earliest of the five Johannine writings in the New Testament Canon, but for inner reasons is assigned to the close of this collection just as the gospels for logical reasons precede the epistles. The order of the Pauline letters is certainly not the chronological. The explanation that they are arranged in accordance with the importance of the places to which they are addressed, is at least probable. Rome was the political center of the empire and Corinth the commercial. But Ephesians, as Ephesus was the capital city of the province of Asia, would be entitled to precedence over Galatians, even if the South Galatian theory is correct, according to which this letter was sent to the congregation at Derbe, Lystra, etc., established by Paul on his first missionary tour. Of the five Captivity letters, the first four evidently date from the close of the first captivity of Paul in Rome, while the fifth, namely, II Timothy, was written at the close of the second captivity, when Paul no longer ex-

pected release as he did in the other four (II Thess. 4, 7-8; Phil. vs. 22). Thessalonians were both written during the second missionary tour of Paul; and naturally there are no letters from the first. The three Pastoral Epistles, Timothy and Titus, constitute a separate group because of their contents, I Timothy and Titus being probably written between the first and the second Roman captivity. In how far the arrangement of the Catholic Epistles is the historical is doubtful, although I and II Peter are probably the earliest, as Peter suffered martyrdom under Nero, around 65 A. D., and the greeting from "Babylon" (I Pet. 5, 13) probably points to Rome where this martyrdom took place (Apoc. 12, 12, 25); and II Pet. 1, 15 shows that this letter was written just before the death of the author. Where the other Catholic Epistles belong historically, particularly James and Jude, and I John, is uncertain. The last mentioned evidently is a late production as it shows much similarity to the Fourth Gospel in style and apparently supplementing it in thought, the former showing who Christ is, the latter what a Christian is. Second and Third John were evidently written when the author was an old man, as in both II John 1 and III John 1 he calls himself the "elder," a fact which probably identifies him with the "Presbyter John," mentioned by the church historian Eusebius and by some scholars regarded as the author of the Fourth Gospel.

The division of the Bible books into chapters and verses was introduced centuries after these books were written and naturally are no factors at all in their interpretation; indeed they are often misleading.

9. The Writers of the Bible. How many writers participated in the composition of these sixty-six

books is not known. In the Old Testament collection in particular there are a considerable number of books whose authors are unknown. This is the case with the books of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Job, and in their present form at least of several others, such as Ezra and Nehemiah. Some of these books are composite productions. On the supposition that the superscriptions of the Psalms are genuine, or at any rate represent reliable tradition, in this collection of one hundred and fifty lyrics, seventy-three are the songs of the poet-king David, to which may be added the psalms of his three singers, namely, the twelve of Asaph (I Chron. 15, 17, 19; 16, 5, 37, and especially II Chron. 29, 30; Neh. 12, 46), then the psalms of Heman or the Sons of Korah, of Ethan and Jeduthun (Ps. 88 and Ps. 89; I Chron. 6, 33, 39, 44; and II Chron. 25, 2, 3, 4; I Kings 4, 31; I Chron. 16, 41, 42); then a special group of ten ascribed to the Sons of Korah, while two, namely, Ps. 72 and Ps. 127 are Solomon's, and the 90th is from Moses. This makes exactly one hundred psalms from known authors, leaving fifty anonymous. It is interesting in this connection to note that the Septuagint has one additional psalm, Ps. 151, attributed to David and composed on the occasion of his victory over Goliath, which may have been a genuine Davidic production; as also the fact that in this early Greek version some of the anonymous psalms are ascribed to authors not otherwise known as psalmists. Thus, e. g., Pss. 137, 148, 149 are attributed to Haggai and Zechariah, and 136 to Jeremiah.

Chapter 30 of Proverbs is declared to be not the production of Solomon, but of Agur, the Son of Jakel, while chap. 31 is said to be the words of King Lemuel,

which had been taught him by his mother. Prov. 25, 1 sqq. are declared indeed to be the proverbs of Solomon, but were not collected until many decades later by the literary school that flourished during the reign of King Hezekiah. This group of proverbs had probably circulated by oral traditions and were then put into permanent literary form, just as the sayings of Jesus circulated for several decades orally in the Apostolic Church until a certain part of them were embodied in our canonical gospels, while others were current as ἄγραφα (cf. Acts 20, 35). In I Kings 4, 32 it is reported that Solomon was the author of three thousand proverbs and that his songs were one thousand and five. As of the 935 proverbs found in the book of Proverbs at most 700 are from Solomon, it must be accepted that more than two-thirds of his wise sayings have not been preserved; and as he composed only two psalms in our present collection—unless some of the anonymous psalms are from his pen, for which however not even the Septuagint gives any data—and is the author of the Song of Songs and of Ecclesiastes (Prov. 1, 1; 10, 1; 25, 1; Cant. 1, 1; Eccles. 1, 1), about one thousand of his songs are no longer extant. This need not be a surprise, since of the hundreds of discourses delivered by Jesus during the three years of His public ministry, only one, namely the Sermon on the Mount, has been preserved with anything like completeness (Matt. chaps. 5-7; Luke 6, 20-49); and in I Cor. 5, 9 Paul corrects a misapprehension of his readers concerning a statement made by him in an earlier letter sent to the Corinthians but now lost, as he could not possibly refer to a misunderstanding of a letter not yet received and hence could not mean the letter he was then writing. In II Peter 3, 1 refer-

ence is made to an earlier letter by this writer, and it is the conviction of excellent scholars, among them Zahn, that the reference here is not to our I Peter but to a lost letter.

Further, the composite character of Deuteronomy, at least as far as the conclusion (Deut. 34, 5-12) is concerned, can not be doubted (cf. especially vs. 10). Jer. 51, 64 contains the formal conclusion of this collection of prophecies, ending with the words: "Thus far are the words of Jeremiah." The 52d chapter, historical in character, must accordingly be regarded as a later addition or appendix, though possibly by the prophet himself, although it makes no mention of him, and hence may have been the production of another pen, just as the conclusion of Deuteronomy is from another than Moses' pen. The case of Jeremiah is paralleled by that of John in his gospel. Here the formal conclusion is explicitly given in John 20, 30-31, where the purpose of the book is announced. Chapter 21 is accordingly an appendix, dealing chiefly with the persons of Peter and of John, and may have been from the pen of the latter at that late period when the prophecy announced by Jesus (Matt. 16, 28; Mark 9, 1; Luke 9, 27; Matt. 10, 23; Matt. 24, 36; Mark 13, 30; Luke 21, 32) had been fulfilled by the destruction of Jerusalem and of the national existence of Israel as the theocratic people who had failed in their historic mission in the Kingdom of God and for whom in this capacity the terrible events of 70 A. D. were the final judgment. In this 21st chapter of John the "we" in vs. 24, who speak in confirmation of the correctness of John's narrative, is still a matter of uncertainty, although tradition declares it refers to the elders of the congregation at Ephesus at the request

It is generally accepted that chapters 17-18 of Judges, dealing with Micah, and chapters 19-21, with Gibeon, are appendices to this book, as their contents deal with matters that chronologically antedate the preceding chapter.

The collection of psalms in the Old Testament illustrates the growth of a Biblical book. It has been divided into five books:

Book I — Psalms 1-41.
Book II — Psalms 42-72.
Book III — Psalms 73-89.
Book IV — Psalms 90-106.
Book V — Psalms 107-150.

Each book closes with a doxology, and Ps. 150 is the doxology of the whole collection. That these five books are not the result of a division made after the whole collection had been made (as the superscriptions in the opening of most of the prophetical books, such as Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, and others certainly were, although other collections, such as Daniel, Obadiah, Jonah have no such general superscription) can be seen from the fact that the end of the Second Book (Ps. 72, 20) closes with the subscription "The Prayers of David the Son of Jesse are ended." Notwithstanding this, there are Davidic psalms in the other books, viz., 86, 101, 103, 108-110, 122, 124, 131, 138-145, eighteen in all. Compare as a parallel case Prov. 25, 1 sqq.

In regard to the authors of the New Testament books we are better informed than concerning the writers represented in the Old, the composers of all,

with the possible exception of one, namely Hebrews, being reasonably certain. Disregarding this one book, the entire New Testament literature is the product of only eight contributors, namely, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, Peter, James, and Jude. Of these writers, only three belonged to the Twelve, namely Matthew, John, and Peter. The James, who is the author of the epistle bearing his name, is evidently not the son of Zebedee and the cousin of Christ (as his mother Salome was probably the sister of Mary, the mother of the Lord, as is reasonably certain from a comparison of Mark 15, 40 and 16, 1 with Luke 24, 10; Matt. 27, 56; John 19, 25, which would also explain her importunate petition for her sons because of her relationship, Matt. 20, 20) as this James was put to death by Herod at an early date and was the first of the Twelve to suffer martyrdom (Acts 12, 2). Nor was it James the Less, also known as the Son of Alphaeus; for nothing is known of the activity of this apostle; but it was James, the brother of the Lord according to the flesh, so prominent in the congregation at Jerusalem (Acts 15, 13 sqq.; 21, 18; Gal. 1, 19; and in Gal. 2, 9), together with Peter and John called "a pillar of the church," and who is even mentioned and praised by the historian Josephus (Antiq. 20, 9), and rather singularly here too termed "the brother of the Lord." When the author in Jude vs. 1, simply calls himself "the brother of James," he doubtlessly refers to this same James so famous among both the Christians and the Jews. We could thus have in the New Testament books the writings of two real brothers of Jesus. The names of the brothers of Christ are mentioned in Matt. 13, 53-57 and Mark 6, 2-4 (the third and fourth in inverted order), and here both the name

James and Jude occur. Rather remarkably, nine of the twelve Apostles of Christ are not found represented in the collection of writings constituting the New Testament Canon.

10. The Time Covered by the Bible. This time consumed in the composition of the books of the Bible is, in round numbers, fifteen hundred years; namely, from the period of Moses, about 1400 B. C., to the completion of John's gospel, between 90 and 100 A. D. Between the close of the Old Testament and the beginning of New Testament, a period of nearly five hundred years intervened, during which there was indeed a great literary activity in Israel, as is evident from the Apocrypha, the large number of Apocalypses, such as the Book of Enoch and other writings dating from the inter-Testament period when the production of canonical literature had ceased. The period from Moses to Malachi covers about a millenium, while the New Testament books were all written within four or five decades, beginning probably with the Epistle of James, about 50 A. D.

11. The Literary Methods of the Biblical Writers.

a) The *Prologue of Luke:* In a number of Biblical books the authors give us interesting information on the methods and manners in which these documents originated. The clearest and fullest statement in this regard is found in the literary introduction to the Third Gospel, Luke 1, 1-4, where the author tells us why and how he proceeded in the composition of this book. He followed the best methods of historiography by consulting the primary sources, namely, the eyewitnesses, whose testimony was all the more trustworthy because of their official status in the church (vs. 2); that he was induced

to undertake this work by the knowledge of the fact that "many" had already compiled accounts of what Christ said and did (the reference here is evidently not to Matthew and Mark alone, but to documents no longer extant, and which could not have been the pseudo-gospels, of which remnants are still extant, but which are later than Luke and all serve heretical tendencies, and Luke does not say that these other writings were unhistorical). The composition of this book was decided upon by Luke himself — for this is what the expression μοὶ ἔδοξε says, although naturally this includes the promptings of the Holy Spirit claimed for all inspired writers by II Peter 1, 21 — and his primary purpose was more fully to instruct Theophilus in those matters in which the latter had already received elementary data (vs. 4). Luke also declares that he proposes to write this account ἀκριβῶς and καθεξῆς, i. e., with historical accuracy and in chronological order. This statement of Luke introducing his gospel recalls at once the opening sentence in that most critical of all Greek historians, Thucydides. Both of these claims as to the literary character of the third gospel are amply evidenced by the facts in the case; and no better proof of this could be asked for than is furnished by Professor Adolf Harnack, of Berlin, in his "Lukas der Arzt," which work covers also the continuation of this gospel, or the Acts (cf. Acts 1, 1). It thus appears that two books originally intended for an individual have providentially become a part of the official canon of the church, as have also several other private writings, notably Paul's letter to Philemon, Phil. 1, and the third Epistle of John addressed to a certain Gaius, cf. III John 1. The Pastoral Letters do not belong to this class, as these were ad-

dressed to Timothy and Titus, not so much as individuals, but in their official capacity as pastors, although especially in the case of Timothy the former element is sometimes prominent, as when in I Tim. 5, 23 Paul gives his pupil some advice concerning his health (the same III John 2); and in II Tim. 4, 13 he requests that Timothy bring along with him to Rome the cloak that he had forgotten at Troas, as also his books and parchments.

The mention of these minor particulars in books now a part of the canon of the church raises the question whether the sacred writers were, when writing, conscious of the fact that they were penning the permanent sources for the faith and the life of the Christians at all times. This was doubtlessly the case in some instances, as in the Pentateuch (Ex. 13, 16; Deut, 6, 8; 11, 18; cf. also Ex. 13, 2-10, 11-17; Deut. 6, 4-9; 13-23); and probably in the Apocalypse (22, 18-19), but seemingly not in the majority of these books. For example, Paul discusses in full problems that he knew would not vex and perplex the church of the future, as in I Cor. 13, sqq. he discusses the relative value of the "gifts" possessed by the Apostolic Church, notably the "gift of tongues," i. e., the ecstatic utterances of religious feelings unintelligible to the others present in the congregation unless there was also somebody present who had the gift of interpreting tongues (cf. I Cor. 14, 2, sqq. especially vss. 19, 23, 27, 28), and yet in this same 13th chapter, vs. 8, he declares that the gifts of prophecy and of tongues shall cease in the church, and according to vs. 13 only faith, hope and love shall continue to be the permanent possessions of the church. In I Cor. 8 sqq. a similar problem now extinct in the church is discussed

in detail, namely, whether it was right for a Christian to eat of the meat of animals sacrificed to idols. In these and similar cases the lesson for our times consists in the underlying principle according to which Paul decides this question, which principle, according to vs. 13, is the duty to avoid offense to a brother, applicable at all times but no longer in that particular form in which it existed in Corinth. The Bible books, notably the epistles, were written along the line of daily duty, which is really the way in which all great movements or works in the Kingdom of God, such as the Reformation, began and begin.

An interesting parallel to the opening verses of Luke's gospel is the Prologue of ten verses furnished by the Greek translator of the apocryphal book of Jesus Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus, in which among other things it is recorded that the author of the Hebrew original was the grandfather (vs. 3) of the translator and that the translation was done in Egypt in the thirty-eighth year of King Ptolemy Euergetes (vs. 8).

b) *The Books of the Kings:* The author of these two books states repeatedly what the sources of his information were and where more details could be secured. In one instance (I Kings 11, 41) he cites the "Book of the Acts of Solomon" for the reign of this king; while for the history of the Kings of Judah he repeatedly cites the "Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah" (e. g., I Kings 14, 29; 15, 7, 23; 22, 45; II Kings 8, 23); and for the history of the Kings of Israel, he repeatedly cites the "Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel" (e. g., I Kings 14, 19; 15, 31; 16, 5, 14, 20, 27; 22, 39; II Kings 1, 18). Just what these "Acts" or "Chronicles" were is not further reported, but

from the fact that they are here referred to as equally trustworthy with the books that use them as a source, it is fair to conclude that they were not the political or state archives of these times, but evidently accounts from a prophetic pen just as other historical books, such as Joshua, Judges and Samuel came from such sources. Scholars are fairly agreed that the history of the prophets Elias and Elisha, found in the closing chapters of I Kings and the opening chapters of II Kings with their wealth of details, is taken from a special source. It will be remembered in this connection that these appeals to other sources are not the oldest in the Old Testament. Already in Num. 21, 14-15 there is a citation from the "Book of the Wars of the Lord," as in Josh. 10, 13 there is one from the "Book of Jasher," from which book there is a second and longer quotation in II Sam. 1, 18-27 called "The Song of the Bow." This book is generally considered to have been a collection of religious hymns. Nothing further seems to be known about these works, which are not even mentioned by Josephus.

c) *Use of Earlier Prophets by the Later:* What was seen above in certain citations in Biblical books from non-Biblical sources, can be seen in Joshua and in later books in references taken from the Pentateuch, and even on a larger scale in references, allusions to, and also in citations found in later prophets and taken from the earlier, but with this exception that these sources are not mentioned by name and that the fact that they are reproductions can be detected only in the similarity of thoughts, words, or expressions. That is the reason why in some instances it is a question, which is the source

and which is the secondary statement, for instance, in the rather many agreements found in the contemporary prophets Isaiah and Micah. Two men, whose names are at the head of two of the Bible books, namely, Daniel and Job, are mentioned in Ezek. 14, 14-20; and that of Daniel a second time in Ezek. 28, 3, but in neither case is to be found any reference to their books. To what extent such a similarity of thought may exist between prophetic utterances can be seen by a comparison of the contents of Micah, chap. 4 to 7 with other prophetic utterances.

Micah	4, 1-3	compare	Isaiah 2, 2-4.
"	4, 3	"	Joel 3, 10.
"	4, 7	"	Is. 24, 24.
"	4, 9	"	Is. 13, 8. Is. 21, 3.
"	4, 13*a*	"	Is. 41, 15-16.
"	4, 13*b*	"	Is. 23, 18.
"	5, 5	"	Is. 9, 6.
"	5, 13	"	Is. 2, 8.
"	6, 2	"	Hos. 4, 1. Hos. 12, 2.
"	6, 4	"	Amos. 2, 10.
"	6, 7	"	Is. 1, 11.
"	6, 8	"	Is. 1, 17. Hos. 6, 6.
"	6, 11	"	Hos. 12, 7.
"	6, 14	"	Hos. 4, 10.
"	7, 1	"	Is. 24, 13. Hos. 9, 10.
"	7, 2	"	Is. 57, 1.
"	7, 3	"	Is. 1, 23. Hos. 4, 18.
"	7, 10	"	Joel 2, 17.
"	7, 11	"	Amos 9, 11.

Other parallels could readily be cited. The book of Amos makes use of Joel, as can be seen from a comparison of Joel 1, 4 and 2, 25 with Amos 4, 9; of Joel 3, 16 with Amos 1, 2; and of Joel 3, 18 with Amos 9, 13. The close relationship of Zech. 14, 1 sqq. with Ezek. 38, 1 sqq. is undeniable and the close connection between Jeremiah and earlier prophets can be easily detected. Thus Jer. 3, 6—4, 4 reminds the reader of Hos. chap. 2 and chap. 14, in a number of verses even to a remarkable degree (e. g., Jer. 3, 22-25 and Hos. 14, 3-5); Jer. 8, 7 is another formulation for the thought contained in Is. 1, 13. The thoughts of comfort expressed in Is. 40, 12-25 for those in the Exile, according to Jer. 10, 11 are to be emphasized by these in their attacks on the futility of the idols. Compare also Jer. 9, 3-6 with Mic. 7, 46; and Jer. 50, 19 with Mic. 7, 14. Naturally some of these similarities could be attributed to accident or have originated in the likeness of the subjects considered by the different prophets, but there are too many of them and not a few are too characteristic to be interpreted without the acceptance of more or less literary dependence.

d) *Duplicates:* A special phase of this problem is suggested by the duplicates found at times in different Biblical books. Thus the last four chapters of the first part of Isaiah, namely chapters 36-39, are historical, and are practically, though not literally, the same as those found in II Kings 18, 13-20, 21 and in a condensed form in II Chron. 32, 1-33. The agreements between Isaiah and Kings in this case are even greater than are found in the Synoptic Gospels and the disagreements smaller and fewer. Either Isaiah draws from Kings, or both draw from common sources; for Kings could not be dependent

on Isaiah as the latter is a much later book. This second supposition is probably correct as in II Kings 20, 20, at the close of the reign of Hezekiah, an additional reference is made to the "Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah," which is however not found in Isaiah. The presence of this section in the prophecies of Isaiah is doubtlessly to be attributed to the fact of this prophet's prominence and even sensational activity during the time of Hezekiah (cf., e. g., II Kings 19, 6 sqq.; 20, 4 sqq.; 20, 12 sqq.).

Another remarkable duplicate is the fact that the entire 51 verses of Ps. 18 are found almost word for word in II Sam. 22. The scores of parallels between the Books of Chronicles and the other historical books, notably Kings, need only be mentioned here. The close verbal agreement as well as agreement in thought, sometimes found as between I Chron. 16, 34-36 and Ps. 106, 1, 47, 48, seems to be the expression of traditional liturgical formulae and not to indicate literary dependence.

e) *The Pentateuchal Problem:* It is virtually claimed as an axiom in critical circles that the Pentateuch is not Mosaic but a mosaic, consisting of different layers or strata, namely, the Priest Codex (P. C.), the Elohist (E), the Jahvist (J), and Deuteronomist (D), and that imaginary creature, the Redactor (R), which layers represent various steps and stages in the religious development of Israel as also different types, even contradictory, of thought, until it culminates in the Levitical system of cultus after the Exile. The mere fact that a Biblical book or a set of Biblical books, internally connected as are those in the Pentateuch, or Hexateuch, counting in Joshua, should still be a com-

posite from different writers at different periods is not as such an impossibility, as has been seen in the case of the Psalms and of Proverbs (cf. Prov. 25, 1; 30, 1; 31, 1). The question is whether this is the case in the Pentateuch.

That this documentary theory is not based on any direct statement of the Pentateuch itself, so that the situation would be one parallel with the Psalms and Proverbs, is recognized on all sides. The Pentateuch does speak of Moses as writing at least certain portions of these books, as Ex. 17, 14; 24, 3-4; Num. 33, 2; Deut. 31, 9-11, 24-26 (cf. with 17, 18-19; 28, 56, 61; 29, 19-20, 26; 30, 10), but it is doubtful if any citation can be found in favor of the Mosaic authorship of the entire collection; certainly not for the book of Genesis, which even indirectly does not claim any connection with Moses as its author except the relation of its contents with those of the succeeding books. The passages cited go only to prove that certain portions of the Pentateuch were written by Moses. The claim for Deuteronomy cannot be doubted.

The only book among these five that shows any clear evidence of being a composite is Genesis. In view of the abundance of archaeological finds in the Bible lands, antedating even by centuries the Mosaic period, notably the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, a century older than Moses, or the Hammurabi column from the age of Abraham, it would be strange if Moses would not have had access to and made use of old literary sources in the preparation of a historical book, which goes back in its beginnings to a period of at least twenty-five centuries before his day, as he actually does in Num. 21, 14, and which closes four hundred years before his birth; and it

is not at all impossible or improbable that one of these sources should have made use of the name "Elohim" for God and another "Jahveh," especially as the sections making use of these names are also characterized by certain other marked peculiarities of style. This fact may be the kernel of truth that underlies the skillfully constructed but largely subjective dissection of the Pentateuch as practiced by modern criticism, and which finds in this stratification of the Pentateuch little more than a bundle of contradictions as, e. g., when it claims that Gen. 1, 1 sqq. and 2, 4b sqq. contain two contradictory accounts of creation, whereas the so-called second story of creation is only a continuation of the first as preparatory to the next matter, the story of the fall of man. Naturally Deut. 34, 5 sqq. is an addition made by a post-Mosaic writer.

f) *Deutero-Isaiah:* A distinct and important literary problem is the question whether the second part of Isaiah (chaps. 40-66) is the production of the author of the first part (chaps. 1-39), or the composition of a great "Unknown" prophet written at the close of the Babylonian Captivity and who accordingly lived about one and a half centuries later than the Isaiah of history. If the latter is the case then the critics are justified in insisting that the book of Isaiah is a composite. A germ of truth underlies this claim, for the author of these twenty-seven chapters, equally divided into three parts of nine chapters each (cf. 48, 22; 57, 21, and the general contents of chap. 66) and discussing one central theme, namely, the speedy release of Israel from the Babylonian Captivity and this as typically prophetic of the salvation through the Messianic Servant of the Lord (cf. especially Is. 53, 2 sqq.), and all of this without the slightest

statement as to the author of these most unique prophetic sermons in the Old Testament—all this shows that the author of these discourses makes his proclamation from the standpoint of the close of the Babylonian Captivity (although Isaiah lived at the time of the Assyrian) and mentions even King Cyrus by name in Is. 44, 28; 45, 1, in which latter passage the Lord even calls this gentile king "My Anointed," or "My Messiah." This is done because those who were set apart for distinguished services in the development of the Kingdom of God were "anointed" for that purpose, i. e., cleansed and purified for their special work. Other men were also "Anointed" or "Messiahs," e. g., Priests were regularly anointed (Ex. 29, 7; Lev. 8, 12 of the high priests; also Ex. 40, 15 compared with 28, 41); also kings (I Sam. 10, 1; 16, 13; II Sam. 2, 4; 5, 3); and occasionally a prophet (I Kings 19, 15-16). Hence too Jesus is called ὁ Χριστός (Matt. 16, 16; Mark 8, 29; Luke 9, 20) as the Anointed One above all others (indicated by the article). But in the second part of Isaiah the prophet does not actually live in the time of the Babylonian Captivity since his real age, namely, the time when the temple, its service, and Jerusalem were not yet destroyed, is indicated by a number of passages, such as Is. 41, 26-27; 42, 9; 43, 9-13; 45, 21; 46, 10; 48, 3-5; also 40, 2, 9, (cf. with 41, 27; 51, 17; 62, 1 sqq.); but the seer projects himself into that period as an historical background, from which alone he could prophecy that greater deliverance from sin and its consequences, for which the deliverance soon to be effected by Cyrus was the prophetical evidence, and for which greater deliverance the real historic background of Isaiah, namely, the period of the Assyrian Captivity offered no satisfactory basis for

Judah, as there was to be no deliverance from this Assyrian Captivity as there was to be from that second and more important captivity, that of Babylon, of which Judah was delivered so miraculously (II Kings 19, 1 sqq.; II Chron. 32, 20-33; Is. 37, 1 sqq.). Besides Judah was the theocratic kingdom, not Israel. The deeper purposes of Deutero-Isaiah called for the Babylonian and not the Assyrian Captivity. There are no ample reasons for regarding the book of Isaiah as a composite by assigning the second part to a different author, especially too because the New Testament accepts the unity of this book.

g) *The Synoptic Problem:* One of the most intricate and elusive literary problems in the entire field of Biblical research is that which deals with the relation between the three Synoptic Gospels, Matthew, Mark and Luke. Briefly stated the problem is this that the agreements, in matter and form, among these three books are so remarkable and many, that there must have existed among them a certain dependence, literary or otherwise, or between them as a group and some other and older source; while on the other hand, the disagreements too are so marked that each must also have been based on some independent source or sources. The Fourth Gospel, that of John, cannot be included in this group called "Synoptics," because the material it contains in common with these three is so exceedingly small that a "synopsis," i. e., a comparative viewing together of what it brings with what the others contain, is practically impossible. With the exception of the account of the closing scenes of Christ's life—and even here the Gospel of John omits leading details, such as the institution of the Lord's Supper and the agony in Gethsemane (John

13, 26 sqq.; 18, 1 sqq.)—there is very little material otherwise that the Fourth Gospel has in common with the other three, and four columns in a Gospel Harmony or Synopsis is a rare phenomenon, being limited practically to the story of the feeding of the Five Thousand, which John in 6, 1-14 has in common with Matt. 4, 13-21; Mark 6, 32 sqq.; Luke 9, 10 sqq. Even when John treats of the same subject matter that the Synoptics do, he handles this in such a different way that a comparative picture of the four accounts is virtually impossible. Thus the testimony of the Baptist concerning Christ, as it is found in Matt. 3, 1-12; Mark 1, 1-8 and Luke 3, 2-18, describes His Messianic mission rather from His office as Judge, or the second coming of the Lord, while the account in the Fourth Gospel, John 1, 19 sqq., describes rather His advent as the Redeemer and the Savior. While it is not explicitly stated in this gospel that its purpose is to supplement the contents of the first three, yet in a number of places, this unique book, written at a time when the other gospels had been known to the churches for a quarter of a century, shows that it does supplement the others so skillfully that this feature can be regarded as one of the purposes of the author. Thus the answer given by Christ to Pilate, when asked if He was a King, is abruptly dropped in Matt. 27, 11; Mark 15, 2 and Luke 23, 3, and it is hard to see why the Roman Procurator should drop a matter here that might be politically dangerous. But the continuation of the matter in John 18, 34 sqq., where Christ declares that His kingdom is not of this world, solves the difficulty, as Pilate evidently came to the conclusion that he had to deal with a religious fanatic merely, to whom

he could then put the contemptuous question: "What is truth?" (John 18, 37).

Thus too in the story of the Five Thousand the natural inquiry how it happened that so many persons were found together in the desert, i. e., in a district not under cultivation, is answered by the remark in John 6, 4: "And the Passover, the feast of the Jews, was nigh," which shows that these thousands must have been a pilgrim caravan on its way from Galilee, through Perea, to Jerusalem, such as is presupposed in Luke 2, 44.

Further, the exact time when Judas left the upper chamber, in which the final Passover was celebrated, in order to betray the Lord, left undecided by Matt. 26, 25; Mark 14, 21 alone, and still more by Luke 22, 29, is made clear by John 13, 26-30, where indeed no mention is made of the Lord's Supper, the institution of which followed the eating of the Passover, yet it is here stated that still during the latter and before its completion Judas left the room, and, accordingly, notwithstanding traditional exegesis, was not present at the Supper. We are told he left "immediately" (εὐθύς). In other particulars too John's Gospel is different from the others. The author almost exclusively confines himself, though not entirely (cf. John 2, 1-12), to the Judean ministry of Christ, and deals almost entirely with the doings of Christ connected with His visits to Jerusalem on the great festivals of the Jewish church year, while the Synoptics confine themselves entirely to His Galilean ministry, although at places presupposing the Judean ministry which they do not mention as in Matt. 23, 37; Luke 13, 34. Again, John's account consists chiefly of addresses and discourses with the rep-

resentatives of the hierarchy (hence in this gospel the word "Jews" is generally equivalent to "leaders of the Jews" as also synonymous with "enemies of Christ") on the one subject of His divinity and His relation to the Father, from whom He came and to whom He will return, while the entire contents of the book, from chap. 13 to chap. 17, is devoted to final instructions given to the disciples. Indeed the Gospel of John contains very little historical material and is rather didactic, as is also explicitly stated in John 20, 30-31 where the real purpose of the book is announced, namely, to prove the divine Sonship of Christ through His miracles. The fact that in this gospel only about half a dozen miracles are mentioned, would make this remark strange, were it not presupposed that the reader is acquainted with those recorded in the other gospels. Other peculiarities of John, such as his failure to mention any of the Parables of Christ, or to employ His favorite self-appellation "Son of Man," so popular in the other gospels, the introduction of persons not found in other gospels, such as Nathanael, Nicodemus, Lazarus, only help to emphasize the unique character of this gospel and to show why it cannot be included in the discussion of the Synoptic Problem.

The Synoptic Problem is accordingly a question as to the literary connection between the books of Matthew, Mark and Luke. Absolutely identical literary parallels among these three, aside from the use of such stereotyped and proverbial forms of thought as "Many are called but few chosen" (Matt. 20, 16); "For the last shall be first and the first last" (Matt. 19, 30; 20, 16); "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear" (Matt. 13, 9; Mark 4, 9; Luke 8, 8), are not entirely

absent, but they are brief and rare, much more so than could be expected if there were actually a literary dependence of one gospel on one or both the others or of all of them on a common older source. The most reasonable explanation of this phenomenal diversity of details connected with a perfect agreement in subject matter, is not that of a literary dependence, but this, that the story of what Christ did and said was originally handed down only by oral tradition in the Apostolic Church, and that when finally in the seventh decade of the Christian Era and perhaps thirty-five years after the death of Christ, these traditions were put into the permanent and fixed forms of the Synoptic gospels, these had in different circles and sections of the church (it will be remembered that Luke was a representative of the Pauline circle and Mark of the Petrine, according to the quotations in Eusebius' Church History from the lost records of the early Church Father Papias) assumed slightly different shapes and that this difference in tradition is reproduced in the details of our gospels.

The divergencies of the gospels are sometimes almost phenomenal. Thus Matt. 27, 37; Mark 15, 26; Luke 23, 38 and John 19, 19 all report the short superscription on the cross, yet no two in perfect verbal agreement. The probabilities are that this superscription was one of some length and that each gospel writer reported what appealed to him, and that all are correct. Seeming discrepancies of this kind generally yield to an easy and natural explanation. In Matt. 27, 44 it is reported that the malefactors also (plural is used) reviled Him, while Luke 23, 39 says that one did this and the other rebuked him. Both accounts are correct. Both

men did this in the beginning of the six hours spent by Christ on the cross, but the one through His words and the happenings of these hours saw the error of his ways and repented. It must be remembered that the gospel accounts are all only selections and extracts from a larger group of facts; and such passages as Luke 6, 38-40, in the shorter account of the Sermon on the Mount found in the Third Gospel (Luke 6, 20-49), show that even the fuller account in Matthew, chaps. 5-7, is not complete but only an abbreviated report. The difference in the oral traditions also readily explains a number of minor differences in the written gospels, such as the difference in the order of the temptations of Christ between Matt. 4, 1-11 and Luke 4, 1-13, where the second and third temptations are inverted; or the mention of the Ninevites before the Queen of the South in Matt. 12, 41-42, while this order is inverted in Luke 11, 31-32; or the fact that in Matt. 16, 6 the Pharisees and Sadducees are mentioned, while in the parallel account (Mark 8, 15) the Pharisees and the Herodians. No doubt all these were mentioned in the original statement of the Lord. Cf. also Matt. 8, 25-26 and Mark 4, 31-33 and Luke 8, 24-25.

That the contents of the synoptic gospels are largely determined by the special purposes of the writers is readily seen. The many Old Testament citations in Matthew show that the author selected from the traditions of the church those facts and teachings which would prove to his Jewish Christian readers that Jesus of Nazareth was the fulfillment of the Old Testament Messianic prophecies, and it scarcely required the explicit statement of Papias to the effect that this gospel was originally written in Aramaic. It is characteristic

of Mark to give many and full accounts of the demoniacs cured by Christ, in order to demonstrate what according to Mark 1, 1 was the Son of God, not in the personal sense in which this is the theme also of John's gospel (John 20, 19-20), but in the sense that Christ had divine power over Satan and his agents. That Luke selected from the traditions of the Church those details which demonstrate the universality of the redemptive work of Christ, also for the Gentile world, is evident from such external facts as these that he traces the lineage of Christ back to Adam, the common ancestor of all mankind (Luke 3), while Matthew, in accordance with his specifically Jewish purposes, traces it back only to Abraham (Matt. 1, 1) and in Luke 3, 1-2 the author makes his story a part of general history, and in addition alone gives details of special value to show that Christ is the Savior of all mankind, as the story of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Penny, the Prodigal Son (Luke 15, 1-32). The same is true of the story of the Pharisee and the Publican (Luke 18, 9-14), the story of Zacchaeus (Luke 19, 2 ff.); and of the repentance of the thief on the cross (Luke 23, 39-41).

The different forms which gospel stories have assumed in the different gospel records can readily be explained on this basis. Thus in the story of the Centurion, as reported by Matt. 8, 5-13 and Luke 7, 1-10, the former reports that the Centurion himself personally came to the Lord and the latter that his case was pleaded by his Jewish friends. In a case of this kind, that story must be regarded as objectively exact which can reasonably explain the traditions also in other forms; which in this case would mean that this Lukean account is more in harmony with objective facts, since

if he had himself gone to the Lord it would be impossible to explain why Luke would have mentioned his friends: but there is no difficulty from the first supposition, since what a man does through others he really does himself and the Centurion certainly was next to Christ the main factor in this event, and the friends quite secondary.

Again, in Matt. 8, 20-34 it is reported that Christ healed two demoniacs in Gadara, while in Mark 5, 1-21 and Luke 8, 26-41 it is expressly stated that there was only one. Evidently there must have been two, but only one was conspicuous in the transaction. Thus too in Matt. 20, 29-34 it is expressly stated that on His last journey to Jerusalem Christ in Jericho restored sight to two blind men, while in Mark 10, 46-52 and Luke 18, 35-41 only one is mentioned. Here too there must have been two; and that one was particularly conspicuous in the transaction can be seen also from the fact that Mark even mentions him by name. Other factors add to the probability of this explanation, since the dialogues here are too long to have been spoken in unison by two persons, as this appears in Matt. 20, 31-34 and Luke 8, 29 sqq. One was spokesman for both. Somewhat different must be the explanation of the difficulty between Matt. 27, 7, where it is stated that the Jewish authorities took the money that the traitor Judas returned and bought a potter's field with it, and Acts 1, 18-19, where it is said that Judas himself did this. Judas' treachery was the occasion and cause for the acquisition of this burial ground, but naturally the buying itself was done by the Jews and not by Judas.

h) *II Peter and Jude:* The agreement in thought and even in words between the second chapter of II

Peter and the Epistle of Jude is so close that the literary dependence of the one on the other must be regarded as a fact. In both the same heresies are described; but the fact that in Peter these are depicted as still impending and accordingly future tenses of the verbs are used (cf., e. g., II Peter 3, 3, 17; 2, 1), while the corresponding verses in Jude (e. g., v. 4) speak of these as already at hand and accordingly use past tenses, shows that it is the latter letter that has made use of the former, and not vice versa. The fact that one letter should make use of another is no more remarkable than is the use of earlier prophecies by later. It is very probable that both letters were addressed to the same people, and as Peter, according to chap. 1, 14, expected his death at an early date, the writer of Jude may have been his successor and have described as present the evils which Peter saw were coming. There are a number of indications to show that the New Testament letters were known in wider circles of readers. In II Peter 3, 13-15 the writer presupposes on the part of his readers a knowledge of even "all" of the epistles of Paul, in which he finds some things hard to understand, which things some "wrench" or "pervert" or "twist" to their own destruction. These difficult points were probably Paul's doctrine of Christian liberty as a fruit of justification, which some perverted into license to sin, as we see from his self-defense on this very point (Gal. 5, 1 sqq). The fact that the author of Jude labored later in the territory of Peter and writes to the same persons need not surprise us, as Peter himself, according to 1 Peter 1, 1, labored in five provinces of Ásia Minor, which had been Pauline territory. That Peter had also been in

Corinth seems clear from the fact that there was a Petrine party in that congregation (1 Cor. 1, 12). As I Peter was written in "Babylon" i. e., Rome (cf. chap. 5, 13) and it is a fixed fact of history that he suffered martyrdom in the eternal city, it is quite probable that he journeyed to Rome through Corinth. It is well known that it was Paul's fixed principle not to labor where others had worked before him, according to Rom. 15, 20; II Cor. 10, 15, 16, probably because his "gift" or charisma consisted in the founding of congregations (1 Cor. 1, 17*a*).

i) *Ephesians and Colossians:* The close relationship between Ephesians and parts of Colossians, both in contents and form, as can be seen from a comparison of Eph. 1, 10 and Col. 1, 20; Eph. 2, 5 and Col. 2, 13; Eph. 3, 1-10 and Col. 1, 25-27; Eph. 4, 22 sqq. and Col. 3, 9 sqq., and other parallels, is to be explained not on the ground of literary dependence, but because these letters were written at the same time, namely, the close of the first Roman Captivity, and were addressed to neighboring congregations that had the same troubles to vex and to perplex them. The Epistle to the Ephesians was not written to the congregation in that city alone (the expression "in Ephesus," in Eph. 1, 1 is not genuine), but is a circular letter to the congregations of that province of which Ephesus was the capital city, and is doubtless the same as "the letter to the Laodiceans" mentioned by Paul in Col. 4, 16, with which congregation the Colossians were to exchange letters. Marcion already quotes the letter to the Ephesians as a letter to the Laodiceans.

j) *Data concerning other Biblical books:* While there are a number of books in the Bible that give us

no hints, direct or indirect, concerning their literary origin and genesis, e. g., Job, Joshua, Judges, others do contain data of this kind, although often meager and of little actual value to the interpreter. Thus in the superscriptions of some of the Psalms not only the names of the authors but also the occasion of their composition is given, as Psalms 30, 34, 45, 46, 54, 57, 59, 63 (also 151 in the Septuagint). The same is true of some of the prophetical addresses in the Old Testament collection, as Is. 7, 1 sqq. (Immanuel); 13, 1 sqq.; 37; 38; 39; or Jer. 20; 21; 25; 28; 29; 32; 33; 34; 38; 42; Ezek. 8; 14; 20; Dan. 2; 3; 4; 5; 6. Of the book of Jonah, the entire historical background is given. Rather remarkably in those groups of prophetic utterance, placed together in the three great prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel and directed against the gentile nations, the occasions that called them forth are rarely given and much less the full historical background. To a certain extent this is done by the smallest book in the Old Testament, Obadiah, which is directed against Edom for having rejoiced over the misfortunes of its kith and kin when Jerusalem had been captured by its enemies (cf. vs. 7 and 12); but even in this case the particular event in the history of the Jews that is meant is not definitely determined. The decision probably lies between the events recorded in II Chron. 12, 9 (I Kings 11, 14-22), or II Chron. 27, 16; or II Chron. 24, 23.

Jer. 36, 32 tells us that the present book of Jeremiah is a second and enlarged edition of the discourses of this prophet, written down by Baruch, his amanuensis, at the express command of God (cf. vs. 27), after the first edition had been burned by King Jehoiakim (vs. 21 sqq. and 28). That other books of the

Bible were also actually written by other than the real authors is clear especially from certain Pauline letters, as writing was at that time a special occupation. Thus in Rom. 16, 22 the writer Tertius makes mention of his own name and sends greetings, and Paul repeatedly adds some statements with his own hand after the formal conclusion of his letter, as I Cor. 16, 24; Col. 4, 18; and in II Thess. 3, 17 he declares that such a personal signature was a sign guaranteeing that the letter is genuine (as he here speaks of "all" letters, it evidently is to be presupposed that he had written a number of earlier epistles—probably now no longer extant, as this epistle is only the second that we have from Paul's hand in the New Testament Canon), something that seemed to be necessary; or according to II Thess. 2, 2, the possibility of a pseudo-letter from the Apostle had to be reckoned with. The section in Gal. 6, 11-18 is possibly such an addition, or it may refer to the whole letter as written by Paul personally. As the dative is used in the Greek, the translation should be "See with what large letters, etc." (thus the R. V.), and may refer to the awkward "printing" of the Apostle unaccustomed to writing. (Cf. the formal conclusion of Romans in Rom. 15, 33, so that chap. 16 is an appendix as is John, chap. 21). A possible parallel to the two editions of Jeremiah are the two editions claimed to exist of the Lukean writings, the Third Gospel and Acts, based especially on the peculiar readings of the Codex Bezae (D), one called the Oriental or Eastern, the other the Occidental or Western text. The differences are comparatively few and insignificant and of little exegetical importance. The whole idea is at best only a hypothesis.

Some especially interesting facts of this kind are furnished by Paul's letters to the Corinthians. The Apostle had closed his second missionary tour in Corinth, as he afterwards did also his third, remaining there on the former occasion eighteen months (Acts 18, 11). He writes the first of these two letters from Ephesus, toward the close of the third missionary tour and had probably not been in Corinth for a period of three or four years, unless the statement that the coming visit is the "third" (II Cor. 13, 1) points to a visit in Corinth not reported in the New Testament. In I Cor. 1, 11 he tells his readers that he secured the information upon which he comments from "those of the household of Chloe," i. e., from the house congregation that assembled for worship in the house of this woman (Rom. 16, 15). Beginning with chap. 7, 1 sqq. the Apostle discusses a number of specifically congregational problems, such as the advisability of marriage under existing conditions, the eating of the meats of animals that had been sacrificed to idols, the relative value of the different spiritual gifts possessed by the Apostolic Church, and particularly by that in Corinth (I Cor, 1, 7), and he does this in reply to inquiries addressed to him in a communication from the Corinthian congregation (I Cor. 7, 1). In II Cor. 7, 5 sqq. we are informed that the contents of this letter were based on information which had been brought to Paul in Macedonia by his pupil Titus, whom he had sent to Corinth to ascertain the effects of his first, and rather sharp, letter; thus in I Cor. 4, 11 he had asked if he should come to them in love or "with a rod" to chastize them, and in I Cor. 4, 6-12 he had arraigned them in bitter irony for their spiritual pride. The failure of Titus to

meet Paul at Troas (II Cor. 2, 12-13) made the Apostle so concerned that he could not continue his work in the latter city and he hastened on to meet Titus in Macedonia, whose report then gave character and contents to the Second Epistle to the Corinthians.

Galatians was called forth by the efforts of Judaizing Christians to undermine the teachings and the apostolic authority of Paul soon (cf. 1, 6) after the Apostle himself had been in Galatia. It is this occasion that makes Galatians (cf. 2, 1 sqq.) the strongest defense of the independent apostleship of Paul as well as of the central doctrine of his preaching, that of justification by faith, especially, in its consequences; and the intense excitement of the Apostle is fully reflected in the strong statements of Gal. 1, 8 and 9 — cf. also I Cor. 16, 2 where "Anathema" means something that is handed over to God for punishment (Greek), while Maran Atha (Aramaic) means "the Lord will come," i. e., to judgment.

Philippians was occasioned by the mission of kindness sent by the people of this congregation to the prisoner Paul in Rome through Epaphroditus, their representative, who because of his zeal took seriously sick and concerning whom the Philippians were worrying (Phil. 1, 12, sqq.; 2, 25; 4, 18, etc).

The congregation at Colossae had not been founded by Paul himself, but by his pupil Epaphras (Col. 1, 7; 4, 12-13) who had evidently applied to Paul for advice in dealing with this congregation. Paul was however well acquainted with a leading member of this congregation, Philemon, to whom he sends the letter bearing the recipient's name, sending back to him his

runaway slave Onesimus, whom Paul had converted (Phil. vs. 10 sqq., vs. 23).

Thessalonians was written because of information brought by Timothy from that city (I Thess. 3, 6 sqq.); and II Thessalonians, soon after the first, because of some serious misunderstandings of the latter by the recipients (II Thess. 2, 1 sqq.). The immediate occasion for the writing of Romans was that Paul, after the completion of his third missionary tour at Corinth, and concluding that his work in this territory was finished (Rom. 15, 23), had now determined to continue his work in Spain (Rom. 15, 24, 28), and to visit the Roman Christians on his way further west (vs. 24), in order mutually to strengthen each other (Rom. 1, 11 sqq.). This program of Paul was the result of his policy to do mission work only in virgin soil (Rom. 15, 20; II Cor. 10, 15-16), so that "preaching" in Rom. 1, 15 must refer to temporary work only.

I Timothy is written to this pupil of Paul, now in charge of the congregation in Ephesus, giving him personal and pastoral instructions, among them that he is to remain in Ephesus until the Apostle returns (I Tim. 1, 3; 3, 14); while II Timothy was probably the last of Paul's letters and written at the close of the second Roman captivity when death was awaiting him (II Tim. 1, 8, 16; 2, 9), and Paul is almost without friends (II Tim. 1, 15; 4, 9-11, 16-18), and urges Timothy to come to Rome at once (4, 21). The letter to Titus, whom Paul had left behind to organize the congregations in Crete (Tit. 1, 4 sqq.), contains fuller instructions and also the injunctions to meet Paul at Nicopolis (3, 12) and then probably to accompany the Aposle on his way to his western field. This letter, like I Timothy, was

probably written between the first and the second Roman captivity.

Other Biblical books as a rule are practically devoid of particulars throwing light on their literary genesis. This is, e. g., the case with Hebrews, the only direct hints as to the origin of which are found in the names Timothy and Italy in 13, 23-24; and the Epistle of James, the recipients of which have never been satisfactorily identified and may have been Jewish Christians who still worshiped together with the Jews in the Synagogues; for the terrible arraignment in James 4, 4 sqq. could scarcely be conceived as referring to the Christians. The same is true also of the sins of the "rich" in chap. 5, 1 sqq., where, as is not infrequently elsewhere the case, the "rich" is practically equivalent to the "wicked" because of the abuse of wealth in the apostolic times (Luke 6, 24), and "dives" in the parable (Luke 16, 20-31) means virtually "wicked," and Lazarus, the beggar, practically the "pious." Possibly the address to "the rich" in James 5, 1 sqq. is a rhetorical appeal to men not present. When Christ (Matt. 11, 5; Luke 7, 22) states as a proof of His Messianic calling that "the poor" have the Gospel preached unto them, He means the spiritually poor who are in a condition to receive it, in accordance with the Beatitude (Matt. 5, 3; Luke 6, 20). It is a well known fact that the separation of the Christians from the Jews took place gradually, and James may possibly be the only Biblical book which the author intended, at least in part, for a non-Christian audience.

12. Comparison with Other Literatures. The Old Testament contains the bulk—though not all—of the literature of the Jews from the pre-Christian pe-

riod. However, neither in quantity, nor in variety, nor in age does it compare with some other ancient literatures, notably that of the cuneiform inscriptions of Babylon, or of the hieroglyphics of Egypt, and possibly of the Hittites, although the literature of this historic people has not yet been deciphered. The literature of the Babylonians, kith and kin of the Israelites, is in some of its specimens a thousand years older than that of the Jews, and contains even an epic, Gilgamesh, with a hero not unlike Hercules. Library cities were not uncommon in Babylon, such as the recently unearthed Nippon. That Palestine too was the seat of an ancient civilization antedating the advent of the Israelites, is amply seen from the report of the spies (Num. 13, 26 sqq.); and among the cities captured by Joshua was Kiriath-sepher, or Book Town (cf. Josh. 15, 15).

But judged merely as human productions the Old and New Testament books have a value superior to any other body of literary remains. This is not so much the case in their rhetorical, oratorical, or purely literary characteristics, although in this respect too portions of the Psalms, Job, Ezekiel, Zechariah, and the Apocalypse can in the brilliant imaginative flights of their authors compare favorably with the writings of other peoples, even of the Greek; but this superiority of Biblical literature consists largely in the absolute truthfulness of the historical parts. The Old Testament does not hesitate to depict openly the sins of its great national heroes, Abraham, Jacob, David, Solomon, and others, and in the New Testament gospels the weaknesses and shortcomings of the Apostles are fully described in the books written by themselves, and in this respect these books all differ materially from other an-

cient literatures, which are accustomed to suppress such disagreeable data. It is not surprising, for instance, that there is no mention made in Egyptian literature of the Israelites. It is not remarkable that in the Babylonian parallels to the Old Testament—and of these there are many—no mention is made of the fall of mankind, but only of the things that contribute to the glory of the Babylonian kings. The capture of Samaria by the armies of Sennacherib is fully reported in the cuneiform inscriptions with a wealth of details as to the booty, but no mention is made of the futile and fatal expedition against Judah and Jerusalem (II Kings 19, 35 sqq.; II Chron. 32, 20; Is. 37, 36).

Thus even from the standpoint of historiography both the Old and the New Testament records are entitled to a position in the front rank of ancient literatures, although it will remain forever true that their chief claims rest not in their literary character but on their contents as the Revelation of God, resulting, through the inspiration of their writers, in a depth of religious ideas and ideals, thoughts and experiences that can find parallels nowhere. The Scriptures are not primarily or chiefly literature, but are the Word of the living God.

CHAPTER II

The Bible as to Its Purpose and Contents

1. The Unity of the Scriptures. Although in the Scriptures we have sixty-six different literary productions, written by scores of authors, in three different languages, and extending over a period of fifteen hundred years, containing productions of many different types and kinds, yet these books are not at all an accidental collection of literary remains from one of the smallest yet most interesting and influential people of the Orient. These writings constitute rather one unique body of religious literature that are inwardly as closely united as they are outwardly in the form of a Canon. In this respect the Bible differs materially from the other "sacred books" of the East, such as the Vedas, the Avesta, the Koran. In the last mentioned, for instance, there is practically no connection between the different suras, or chapters, nor does the whole collection present any unity or common purpose, such as is found in the Bible.

That this is actually the case with the Scriptures is the testimony of the Scriptures themselves. This is particularly the case as far as the Old Testament is concerned when quoted by the New. When the latter cites "the Scriptures" (e. g., Matt. 22, 29; 26, 54; Luke 4, 21; 24, 27, 32, 45; John 2, 22; 5, 39; Acts 17, 11; 18, 28; II Tim. 3, 15-16) the Old Testament writings in their entirety are meant as also the fact that these

constitute the one revelation of God and the basis of the New Testament. In fact from the very outset of the Old Testament the laws of the Pentateuch start out from the presupposition that they are to constitute the permanent legal code for the later religious development of the Jews; and they were recognized as such by later books (cf., e. g., Deut. 31, 24-26; Josh. 24, 25-26; I Sam. 10, 25). The contents of these books are so intertwined and interwoven that they cannot be torn apart. Joshua and the other "former prophets" are the continuation of the Pentateuch; the poetical and the prophetical books are simply inexplicable without the religious development described in the earlier books as is seen in their frequent reference to the "law" of Moses (e. g., Josh. 1, 8; Is. 24, 5; 5, 24 and repeatedly), as also in the New Testament (e. g., Matt. 5, 17, 18; Luke 16, 17; Matt. 22, 36, 40; Rom. 10, 4; Heb. 2, 3; Rom. 2, 13; 3, 20, 28; 5, 13, etc.). The New Testament is altogether without a historical and religious foundation without the Old, and the Old incomplete and unfinished without the New. The dictum of St. Augustine; Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet; Vetus in Novo patet" (the New Testament lies concealed in the Old and the Old lies revealed in the New) expresses not only a prime hermeneutical principle but also a most important fact with reference to the relation of the Bible books to one another. There is in fact in the entire collection not one book that can be intelligently understood or explained without presupposing the contents of one or more or all of the other books in the Scriptures. In this respect there is not one perfectly independent literary production in the entire Bible. Even a book like Job, with a prescribed and

definite theme, namely, the problem as to the purpose of God in inflicting sufferings on His children, can be understood only when the Old Testament conception of God, His justice and purpose in dealing with men, and kindred matters that are found in the other books, are used.

The connecting link that constitutes the unity of the contents of this varied Biblical library is Christ, and the entire world of thought found between the lids of the Scriptures receives its proper interpretation only in their bearings on Him and His work. Even a book like Esther, that does not even by name mention God, represents one stage or step in that historical development which in the fulness of time culminated in the advent of Jesus Christ into the world. The only correct way to understand the Scriptures is to interpret them Christo-centric; which does not mean that every passage or group of passages must have a direct relation to Christ—an idea that has not infrequently led to fantastic allegorical interpretations—but it does mean that every such passage or group of passages, interpreted according to the sane and scientifically correct historico-grammatical principle, receives its real and full meaning when its bearing, direct or indirect, on the redemptive plan realized by Christ, has been recognized. Thus, e. g., the Levitical system with its elaborate cultus as depicted in the book of Leviticus, while containing historical and legal data of its own, yet its full purpose and meaning has been brought out only in the work of Christ, as this is one purpose of the Epistle to the Hebrews to demonstrate. The same is also true of Old Testament types and prophecies.

Biblical evidence for the Christo-centric character of the entire Scriptures abounds. Thus in John 5, 46 Christ declares that Moses, in the oldest books of the Bible, has testified of Him, having in mind such passages as Gen. 3, 15; 49, 10; Deut. 18, 15; and in vs. 39 that all the Scriptures of the Old Testament have done so (cf. Luke 24, 27, where the same claim is made for the entire Old Testament); and in John 1, 46 Philip makes this claim. In Luke 24, 25-27 Christ declares that the same sources had predicted His passion. Other passages to the same effect are Acts 3, 24: 10, 43 (Is. 53, 5, 6; Jer. 31, 34; Ezek. 34, 16; Dan. 9. 24); 18, 28; 26, 22 (Luke 24, 44); I Pet. 1, 10; Rom. 3, 21; Heb. 13, 8. The most important class of predictive prophecies in the Old Testament are the Messianic promises, referring not only to the person but even more fully to the work of the Redeemer; and the intimate way in which prophecy and fulfillment are interwoven can be seen, e. g., in the relation of Old Testament type and New Testament antitype, particularly in the Levitical cultus with its priesthood, its sacrifices, its services, etc.

The intimate connection between Biblical books and their contents is often greater than appears on the surface. It has, for instance, often been made a matter of reproach to the three Synoptic Gospels and even to the Fourth Gospel that these contain so little material on the doctrine of the atonement through the blood of Christ, which constitutes the burden of the Pauline epistles; and a lack of historical perspective has often declared that there is a contradiction between the teachings of Christ in the gospels and the elaborate exposition of this matter by Paul. It must not be for-

gotten that the gospels were not written until the Pauline interpretation of the fundamental facts of the gospels had been for thirty and more years preached everywhere and that the record of facts as found in the gospels were written for people for whom the interpretation of these facts had for a generation and more been the sole spiritual food and drink. The readers of the gospels, as these latter were issued, were then more thoroughly acquainted through the preached word with what these facts, which as matters of hisory only the gospel writers proposed to give, signified soteriologically. Besides even the Synoptic Gospels at times clearly presuppose this doctrine and use the technical Pauline term for it (Luke 1, 68; 2, 38 (2, 25); Matt. 20, 28; Mark 10, 45). While the gospels only incidentally mention the atonement, they throughout presuppose it, otherwise these writings would lose a leading object in their composition.

2. The Bible not a System. Only to a very limited degree and only in certain parts can it be said that the Scriptures contain or offer a systematic body of certain doctrinal and ethical teachings. The Bible is not a catechism or a dogmatics, no thesaurus of *dicta probantia,* or proof passages, from a systematic standpoint. The Bible, and it alone, contains the material out of which the Christian theologian is permitted to construct a theological system, but it does not give this system itself, as little as Christ or Paul have handed down such a system. Individual doctrines, more or less fully elaborated, and to a certain extent some of the relations of such doctrines to each other, are indeed found in the Scriptures, but not a logically rounded out, or logically complete exposition of Christian doctrines

as such. Evidently the Biblical writers, as little as did Christ, deemed it unnecessary to construct such a system, good as such a structure is for the sake of the truth itself, as also over against the vagaries of errorists. The nearest approach to such a system even within a circumscribed territory is found in Leviticus; but this is only one element in the body of Biblical truth, namely, the Ceremonial Law. Probably as near a purely theoretical book as we have in the Bible is Job, the theme of which is the Theodicy, or the vindication of God for permitting His children to suffer. Another example of a more or less systematic presentation of one group of revealed truths is found in the second part of Isaiah (chaps. 40-66), or in the last eight chapters of Ezekiel (chaps. 40-48), but even in these two cases the concrete historical background is apparent: in the former the promised deliverance from the Babylonian captivity already inaugurated by Cyrus (Is. 44, 28; 45, 1); in the latter the prophet is giving directions to a certain degree for the reconstruction of the temple in Jerusalem.

In the New Testament there are some approaches to abstract systematization of certain groups of divine truth, but here too for concrete historical purposes. The Gospel of John contains Christ's own Christology, but portrays this doctrine solely from the standpoint of His relationship to the Father, from whom He came and to whom He returns, and is therefore only a partial presentation of this cardinal truth, and in this case too for the special instruction of His disciples on that subject with which the church they were to be instrumental in establishing would stand and fall (Matt. 16, 18; Eph. 2, 20 (Is. 28, 16; Ps. 118, 22); Acts 4, 11).

Romans contains a discussion of the doctrine of justification by faith alone, but largely with the negative purposes of demonstrating the incorrectness of the popular Jewish doctrine of justification by works (cf., e. g., Rom. 3, 24, 28, where the negative feature of the conclusion is mentioned first), and further, to meet conditions in the congregation in Rome. Hebrews is probably the most abstract of New Testament books, indeed so much so that not a few scholars regard it rather as a theoretical theological treatise than as a letter; but this letter too contains many references to concrete conditions in the congregations for which it is intended (e. g., Heb. 2, 3; 5, 12; 10, 37; 13, 13, 21). The specific theme of this letter is the superiority of the New Testament covenant over that of the Old. In Ephesians the doctrine of the invisible church is in the forefront and in Colossians the sufficiency of Christianity; in James the thesis that true faith is a vital principle and must produce good works is emphasized. It is for this reason too that the Scriptures do not contain complete and logically formulated definitions of any particular Christian doctrine. It is not accidental that in the confessions, the dogmatics, and the catechisms of the churches, and indeed in any of the efforts put forth by the Church to define her doctrinal convictions, purely Biblical forms and formulas are not to be found, simply because they are not extant. A few fairly good definitions from Biblical sources might be cited, as Heb. 11, 1 for faith; while Rom. 6, 23 contains the whole plan of salvation in substance and is perhaps in material the richest and fullest single passage in the Bible, although John 3, 16 might be quoted as a rival,

but not in fulness of thought; yet the purposes of these passages too are rather practical than thetical.

3. Why the Bible Contains No System. The answer is to be found in the simple and single fact that the books of the Bible were primarily written for insiders and not for outsiders, i. e., for those who were already in the household of faith, who were believers or Christians, and not for those who were unacquainted with the truths of the Christian system. Christianity was not in its origin and establishment a book religion; it did not grow out of the promulgation and publication of the Bible or the parts of it; but rather these grew out of Christianity, and its predecessor in the Old Testament, the Jewish Church. Christianity is older than the Bible. In both the Old and the New Testament dispensations the Church was intended to be and really was established by the preaching of the Word; the literary formulation of this word, not in abstract, but in a certain concrete historical setting, came later. Christ directed His Apostles to do their work by preaching and teaching (Matt. 28, 19-20; Mark 16, 15-16), but never once makes mention of writing, just as He too made use only of the former method. The Church began with the preaching of the protevangelium in Paradise (Gen. 3, 15); but the earliest written records of the plan of redemption, announced in the Pentateuch, date fully twenty-five hundred years later. The will of God during this ante-literary period was promulgated solely by oral prophetic utterances. In the same way the Christian Church was founded by the preaching of the Word; and the fact is that none of the Apostles wrote their gospels, or epistles until several decades later, the Epistle of James, prob-

ably the oldest New Testament book, dating possibly from 50 A. D., or fully twenty-one years after the death of the Master, which occurred in all probability in 29 A. D. Only then when the oral tradition and proclamation was endangered by heretical tendencies in doctrine and life, when the early Christians needed rebuke, admonition, further instruction and the like, were these books written: and their primary purpose was not to meet the needs of countless unborn generations of Christians in ages to come but to meet the wants of the Apostolic times and the persons for whom these books were in the first instance written; although the way this was done was by the inculcation of those very principles which must guide and direct the church at all times and places, but all this in the concrete and timely form demanded by the problems and perplexities of the New Testament Age. The New Testament epistles in particular are thus *Gelegenheitsschriften,* i. e., writings intended for particular conditions and occasions; and they accordingly contain the principles of divine truth only to that extent and degree and in those phases and from those viewpoints which the Apostolic Age demanded. They thus aim primarily to supplement, explain, elaborate, and apply the oral word, and to a great extent to correct abuses which at that time had found their way into the churches.

An instructive example of this relation of the written word to the oral is furnished by the Antichrist pericope (II Thess. 2, 1-12). Here Paul, in vs. 2, first gives his readers the rather surprising warning that in regard to the question at issue, concerning which the Thessalonians had misunderstood his state-

ments in I Thess. 4, 14 sqq., namely, the time of the second coming of the Lord, they should not be misled by any pseudo-letter that might be sent them as though coming from him; and then in vs. 5 he reminds them of what he had said to them on this subject when he was with them. In I Cor. 4, 17 Paul states that the written message is to be supplemented by an oral message through Timothy. Unfortunately for the modern Bible student he does not know what Paul had preached at Thessalonica on the subject of Antichrist, and hence the people of that city had an advantage over even the best and the most learned savant of the present age in his effort to discover what Paul meant by this crux in II Thess. chap. 2. But in this respect the original recipients always had the advantage over the modern scholar, as they, and not the latter, knew the historical background of these letters. Thus the Apostle (I Cor. 15, 29) makes a reference to a "baptism for the dead" and bases on this an argument in favor of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. The Corinthians knew what Paul referred to and could understand his argument; we do not know the facts in the case and hence cannot appreciate his argumentation as fully as we would like to. This too is the reason why we do not fully understand the indignant denunciations of the Apostle in Gal. 1, 1-10; and if we knew who his adversaries were in Corinth and what their charges against him were in II Cor., chap. 10 and following, we would be able to understand better his strong arraignment of these people.

4. How the Doctrinal Contents of the Scriptures are Given. Since the contents of the Scriptures on the whole grew out of the conditions of the Church,

both of the Old and of the New Testament, at the time when these books were written and are expressions of the stage which revelation had reached when they were written as also of certain phases, ideas and ideals of doctrinal and ethical thoughts that through prophetic inspiration and proclamation had been up to that time developed in the Church, as this is, e. g., the case in Psalms, Proverbs, Job, and elsewhere; or, since these writings, as is seen particularly in the New Testament epistles and really also in the gospels, which are not in the ordinary sense historical writings, but rather historical facts and data selected to teach certain lessons, are primarily intended to meet certain concrete conditions and needs in the early Apostolic Church, and are accordingly in the first instance written for believers at one particular stage in the history of the Kingdom of God on earth: it follows that it is only natural that in the doctrinal and ethical teachings of these books, we should find the gospel truths and their interpretation, in themselves eternal, given in a form and to that extent which would meet best the needs of the people for whom they were written. In Romans, the Apostle discusses such problems and does this in such a manner, as was needed by the situation in the congregation at Rome, although we may not now be able to determine the exact reason why just this or that subject is selected for discussion, as, e. g., why in chap. 13, 1 sqq. we find a rather full discussion of the ethical problem dealing with the duty of Christians toward the state. Again, in the Epistles to the Corinthians, Paul discusses those problems which were living and burning issues in this congregation, and probably in none of the other New Testament writ-

ings can the historical conditions that called forth these special discussions be more clearly seen and utilized as factors in the interpretation than is the case in these two letters, which could for this reason be readily called "congregational Epistles"; although even here we cannot fully grasp the situation, as e. g., why the Apostle should find it necessary to present such an elaborate argument in favor of the resurrection of Christ and of the dead, as he does in I Cor. 15, 1-58, further than the surprising fact indicated in vs. 12 that there were some in the congregation at Corinth who denied the resurrection of the dead. The report that reached Paul of parties in the church (I Cor. 1, 12) was the occasion for the discussion of this question in the first four chapters of this book. One of the results of this condition of affairs is that the Apostles in their letters may discuss problems of vital interest to their readers but in that form no longer existing in the Church. This is particularly the case in I Cor. 8, 1 sqq. where Paul discusses fully the question whether it is right for Christians to eat the meat of animals sacrificed to idols (although the fundamental principles here elaborated are of essential and permanent value at all times in the discussion of the problems of Christian liberty and of the Adiaphora); or of the relative value of the spiritual gifts with which the Apostolic Church was endowed (chap. 12, 1 sqq.) and which the Apostle then already knew were not to remain a permanent possession of the church, as is plainly taught in I Cor. 13, 8, where it is declared that the gift of tongues, of prophecy, and of knowledge were to cease, but not love; and in vs. 13 it is declared that only this gift shall have absolute permanency, al-

though faith and hope shall continue, together with love, as gifts of the church, when the others are no longer present—a fact proved by the conditions of the Post-apostolic Church.

Another problem repeatedly discussed by the Apostle Paul and demanded by the times was the defense of his apostolic authority in Gal. 1, 11 sqq.; 2, 1 sqq.; II Cor. 11, 1 sqq. A very special matter of only timely interest to the Apostolic Age and mentioned repeatedly was the collection he was raising in the richer gentile congregations in Galatia and Greece for the poor Christians in Jerusalem spoken of in Rom. 15, 26; I Cor. 16, 1; II Cor. 8, 1-4; 9, 2, 12 (Acts 11, 29-30; 12, 25); and which in Gal. 2, 10 is declared to have been in conformity with a special promise to the "church pillars" in Jerusalem when Paul's work and his mission methods among the Gentiles were officially recognized by the mother congregation at the Apostolic Convention in Jerusalem.

It goes without saying that many of the Scriptural truths, and that too the greatest and most fundamenal truths of the plan of salvation, since these are and can only be the result of divine revelation, are absolutely independent of historical conditions, both in contents and in form, although historic conditions may have determined the time and even the manner in which they were uttered and promulgated. The doctrines of salvation in the Scriptures are a revelation and not an evolution; and such central truths as the proclamation of the incarnation in John 1, 14; II Pet. 1, 17 and many others are announced and must be understood purely as divine revelations. Yet even some of these can be recognized in their exact meaning

only when seen in the historical setting in which they are found. Thus Matt. 11, 28, the invitation for all that are heavy laden to come to Christ, by the general context is shown to mean specifically an invitation to discard the heavy legal yoke of the Jewish orthodoxy of Christ's day, as expressed in the Pharisaism of the times, and rather to accept the easier yoke of faith offered by the Master. How many of the more abstract declarations of doctrine and life found in some of the Epistles, especially II Peter, Jude, Colossians, the Pastoral and perhaps others, and in the writings of John, both the gospel and I and II John, have been suggested by the heretical tendencies of Gnosticism, Donatism and other erratic movements of religious thought current in apostolic times and threatening the Church, can only be partially answered because of our ignorance of the particular manifestations of these tendencies. Special mention of such tendencies are made occasionally as, e. g., Rev. 2, 6, 15 of the Nicolaitans, who are probably meant in II Pet. 2, 10, 12, 13.

5. The Teachings of Jesus.

a) *In General:* This concrete character and the timeliness of the teachings found in the New Testament letters are only an adoption of the pedagogical methods of Christ Himself. While He declares that what He preaches are the eternal verities of salvation that will outlast heaven and earth (Matt. 24, 35 (Matt. 5, 18; Luke 16, 17) Luke 21, 33) and sums up His final command in the great commission (Matt. 28, 19-20), in the direction given to the disciples that all mankind is to keep the things He has commanded them, it is nevertheless true that the bulk of His teachings during His three years spent in instructing His

disciples, as reported in the gospels, both the Synoptics and John, contains primarily those truths and those forms of truth which the disciples needed in the preparation for their life's work. This is true also of that most abstract of all gospels, the fourth. The entire purpose of Christ in both His ministry with the disciples and with the people at large, was not primarily to win from these the acknowledgment that He was the promised Messiah — for all would have been only too willing to recognize Him as such, if He would have been willing to establish a carnal kingdom, which was the mistaken expectation even of His warmest friends (e. g., John 6, 15; 12, 13; Matt. 20, 20-28; Mark 10, 35-45; Luke 19, 37-38; Mark 11, 10) and of the disciples themselves down to His ascension, as indicated by their last question (Acts 1, 6; Luke 24, 21) — but rather this fact that, as the realization of the Old Testament Messianic predictions, He was and must be the divine Son of God and that His Kingdom must be spiritual and be conditioned by His sufferings and death. Hence the epoch-making importance of the confession of Peter (Matt. 16, 16; Luke 9, 20), followed at once by His first declaration of the fact that He must go up to Jerusalem to suffer and to die (Matt. 16, 21; Mark 8, 31; Luke 9, 22; already foreshadowed in Matt. 12, 40; John 2, 19; Matt. 26, 61; 27, 40; repeated in Luke 9, 31 and by implication in Matt. 17, 9; Mark 9, 9 and openly in Matt. 17, 21; Mark 9, 31; Luke 9, 44, in which cases the ignorance of the disciples does not mean that they could not understand the fact as such, but the significance of this fact in His life and work). According to John 20, 31-32 it is the purpose of the facts recorded in this book to prove to the dis-

ciples and to all mankind that Christ was the Son of God, which was exactly the prime object of the Lord's Ministry; and what is here given must have constituted a most or actually the most essential part of His work with the disciples, although not a few of these things may not have become clear to them until they had received the Spirit who was "to guide them into all truth" (John 14, 26; 15, 26-27), as some of these were not understood at the time they were spoken (John 2, 22; 13, 7; Matt. 17, 9; Mark 9, 9). John's gospel is accordingly not a foreign element in the instructions of the disciples by Christ and hence unhistorical, as is claimed by the critics, but is a most essential part of this work, and not without parallels also in the synoptic gospels (e. g., Luke 10, 21-22).

Christ was a very timely teacher and waited for the psychological moment in which to impart new important truths. Compare on this Matt. 16, 21 and Mark 8, 31, according to which He had during the first two years of His ministry never as much as mentioned His passion and death to the disciples, though it is clearly referred to in His conversation with Nicodemus (John 3, 14), and which from now on He not only mentions repeatedly—but always significantly, constantly also adding the fact of His resurrection—and which now so completely filled His heart and soul that seemingly unconsciously references to it are introduced in His discourses, as e. g., Luke 10, 18, where the good reports brought back by the Seventy awaken in Him the prophetic vision of the complete destruction of Satan soon to be achieved by His death. (The imperfect tense here used "I saw" is the prophetic perfect referring to a future fact as already consummated.)

Christ did not want any premature announcement to be made even of such an important fact as His divine origin and descent, as His contemporaries, because of their purely mathematical conception of the oneness of God, could not grasp the idea that this divinity was in perfect harmony with a plurality of persons and could entertain such a thought only after He by His ministry and service had gained their full confidence to accept such a "hard saying" (John 6, 60). This was His reason for forbidding, in the beginning, the demoniacs from declaring Him to be the Son of God (Mark 1, 34; Luke 4, 41; cf. also Acts 16, 17-18), as such declarations by the demons were only intended to embarrass Him by announcing something for which He knew the people were not yet ready. He even forbade the disciples for the time being to make known their conviction that He was the Christ of God (Matt. 16, 20; Mark 8, 30; Luke 9, 21). While occasionally, as in Mark 5, 19-20; Luke 8, 31, He permitted and even commanded—probably on account of peculiar local and temporal circumstances—to have His good deeds publicly proclaimed, yet He repeatedly forbade such an announcement, as in Mark 7, 36. It will be recalled that it was this very claim of being the Son of God that led to the condemnation of Christ by the Jewish authorities (Matt. 26, 63-66; Mark 14, 61-63; Luke 22, 70-71). That in John's gospel too the instructions of this book were intended in the first place for the disciples is seen from the fact that the largest single section is devoted exclusively to their instruction on the last evening of Christ's life, namely, from chap. 13, 1 to 17, 26. Not one word in this section is a declaration of the Lord in public; and the public discussions found

in the preceding chapters are delivered largely with a view of influencing the disciples (cf. John 2, 11; 6, 67). The reason why Christ more and more as time advanced confined Himself to the instruction of His disciples, even when multitudes were present (Luke 12, 1; Matt. 13, 36), is the fact that He recognized that Israel as a people would not accept His Gospel; that the Old Testament Church as such would not be transformed into the New Testament Church; and that only by the establishment of an *ecclesiola in ecclesia* of His disciples could a spiritual Messianic Kingdom be founded. The Master foresaw this rupture in the historical development of the Kingdom of God on earth early in His career, as is evidenced from Matt. 8, 11-12; Luke 13, 28, and this is the real lesson taught by some of Christ's later parables (cf. Luke 16, 2 sqq.; Matt. 21, 43 (cf. vs. 45), as it is also the lesson of the Barren Fig Tree, Matt. 21, 17 sqq.; Mark 11, 12 sqq.). The adaptation of Christ's teachings in this first instance to meet the wants of His disciples is especially clear from some special data. Thus, in Matt. 10, 5, Christ particularly instructs the Twelve, whom He now for the first time sends out on an independent mission journey to preach the Gospel, after they had twice already been His companions on such journeys (Matt. 4, 23-25; Mark 1, 35-39; Luke 4, 42-44; Luke 8, 1-3), that they are not to go to the Samaritans nor among the Gentiles; and yet the same Master afterwards sends them to the ends of the earth as in Matt. 28, 19-20. The former is a preliminary command for the work they were to do for Him during His stay on earth; the latter their permanent instructions: and He assigns as the reason for this restriction of their field of operations the same which

He places upon Himself, namely, that then, when salvation was yet in the process of being realized, He and they were to confine themselves to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, the nation chosen by God for this historic mission (Matt. 10, 6; 15, 24). The further instructions given in Matt. 10, 7 sqq. are also special commands given only for this journey and are not for general application, as little as the command "to greet no one on the way," so that the time-robbing ceremonial greetings of the Orient will not interfere with urgent work they are to do.

b) *The Sermon on the Mount:* That the Sermon on the Mount is not a general scheme on the gospel program is already apparent, not only from the fact that the essentials of this Gospel, such as the Person and Divinity of Christ, His atoning death, faith and the like, are not mentioned in this address, except to a limited extent by presupposition in the Beatitudes (Matt. 5, 3-10), but also from the explicit statement that this discourse was not spoken to the people in general (although they were present, Matt. 7, 28), but specifically to the disciples—taking this term in the wider sense as "pupils" and "followers" but not confined to the Twelve, since the Sermon contains directions addressed to these latter not in their capacity only as official Apostles, to which office they had just before this been appointed (cf. Matt. 10, 2-4; Mark 3, 13-19; Luke 6, 12-19), but also merely as Christians. In Matt. 5, 1-2 it is expressly stated that His disciples came to Him and that this fact led to this Sermon; and the same is found in Luke 6, 20. It was not uncommon that Christ confined His instructions to His disciples even when others were present, as is seen from what

the Evangelists report in connection with His introduction of the Parables (cf. Matt. 13, 2-3; Mark 4, 1; Matt. 13, 10 sqq.; Mark 4, 10; Luke 8, 10); and in all three gospels the statement is made that Christ introduced this innovation in His method of teaching in order to reveal certain thoughts to the disciples which He wanted to conceal from the people in general — the strongest expression being found in Mark 4, 12*b*. This contrast between instructions to the disciples and those for the people appears in an interesting way in Luke 12, 1-59, where vss. 1-12 are addressed to the former, vss. 13-21 to one of the crowd, vss. 22-40 to the disciples, vss. 41 sqq. to Peter. This fact explains some of the details of this pericope, as the "fire" in vs. 49. For, since "fire" is generally used in the New Testament not as the destructive element, but as the agency to separate the good from the bad, the gold from the dross, and hence, too, symbolically of the judgment (e. g., I Cor. 3, 13), though only when used with a modifier to indicate its destructiveness is it used in this latter sense (e. g., Matt. 18, 8-9; Mark 9, 47)—but contrasted with the same word in vs. 48 where it is the cleansing element — it here means the separation caused by the coming of Christ, as He Himself says in vs. 52 sqq. The baptism here mentioned is the suffering by which He is to be overwhelmed, as is the case also in Mark 10, 38*b*, which is only a repetition of the preceding verse, which alone is found in Matt. 20, 22.

That fact that Christ should deliver this address at this time, which is the beginning of the second year of His ministry, according to the more chronological order of Luke 6, 20-49, who quite correctly places this Sermon directly after the official call of the Twelve to

the Apostleship (cf. also Mark 3, 14*b*), is in full harmony with the further fact that it was now that He was beginning to prepare them for their special work; and to do this He first of all had to acquaint them with the deeper and higher significance of the Law over against the superficial conception of current Pharisaism, which could say: "These things have I done from my youth up: what lack I yet?" (Matt. 19, 20). And this is the first and historic purpose of the Sermon on the Mount. It is an anti-Pharasaic address, as is also directly stated in Matt. 5, 20 and is with equal clearness implied in the religious thoughts and life that Christ criticises (e. g., Matt. 6, 1-23; 7, 1-5; Luke 6, 37-40). This theme and prime purpose of this address also shows the connection between the different parts (as, e. g., Matt. 6, 23 and 24; Matt. 7, 20 and 21); and it is this contrast between the superficial and external interpretation of the Law as advocated by the Jewish orthodoxy of the day and the higher spiritual conception demanded by Christ, that underlies the conclusion of the discourse (Matt. 7, 24-27; Luke 6, 47-49). It was Christ's purpose in this Sermon to wean His disciples away from the Pharisaism of the day and to prepare them, by a better conception of Law, to accept the Gospel He had to preach, so that in this way the Law would become a schoolmaster, or a tutor unto Christ, according to Paul's explicit statement in Gal. 3, 24.

From this viewpoint the details of this discourse become clear. Thus Matt. 5, 13 is a warning to the disciples that upon their faithful personal adherence to the principles He inculcated depended the true development of the Kingdom of God on earth, because in the

hands of the Jewish hierarchy it was spiritually decaying. Again, the sudden declaration in Matt. 5, 17, that He had not come to destroy but to uphold the Law in all its details, was to meet the possible objection that His opposition to the religious thought and life of the times was radical and revolutionary of the very basis of the Jewish Church. Thus again in Matt. 6, 24 the warning against serving two masters is an outcome of the truth of the preceding verse, which is characteristic of the totally false ideas of the Pharisees; and the promises of God's protection to the disciples in Matt. 6, 25 sqq. is intended to meet the possible fear that in breaking away from the orthodoxy of the day, the followers of Jesus would risk all they had, even their lives. The Sermon on the Mount can be correctly understood only when viewed historically and only thus do its deep religious principles come to the surface.

c) *The Parables of Christ:* That the Parables also were intended in the first instance as instruction given by Christ to the disciples, has been seen already under *b,* but with this special purpose, that they were intended to equip them with that knowledge concerning the Kingdom of God, its character, future development, and method of proclamation, which they needed in their capacity as preachers of this kingdom, both during the time when Christ was yet with them and also for that period when the Gospel was to have a world wide mission. The Parables have accordingly all mission themes, although at times indirectly so. They appear in the gospels in two groups, one dating from the second year of Christ's ministry in Galilee; and then no mention is made of Parables until well on in the third year, particularly at its close; and here they

were spoken in Peraea and Judea, the first in this second group being the Good Samaritan (Luke 10, 20-37), the next being probably several months later (Luke 14, 7 sqq.), when the second group properly commences. The first group of seven Parables (as reported in Matt. 13, 1-53; Mark 4, 1-25; Luke 8, 4-18), which according to Matt. 13, 53 were all spoken at the same time and not collected from a large period, all deal with certain phases and characteristics of that Kingdom, which the disciples were to proclaim, and of which they had as yet only elementary conceptions, according to Matt. 13, 12, where the second clause means that the gospel opportunities hitherto offered by Christ's ministry to the people in general were to be withdrawn, which is in substance also the meaning of Mark 4, 12*b*. In the first Parable, the Sower, the disciples are informed that the success of their efforts may depend on the character of their hearers; in the Parable of the Tares, the fact is declared that the complete separation of the true and the false can take place only in the final judgment; in the third Parable, that the growth of the Kingdom is gradual and does not depend on man's effort; in the Parable of the Mustard Seed, the fact that this Kingdom would everlastingly spread over all the world; in the Parable of the Leaven, the principle that this Kingdom develops from within and is eventually to transform all the thoughts and activities of man; and similar purposes are found in the concluding Parables of this group. The latter group also contains direct instructions for the disciples and their immediate work. The triplet of Parables, the Lost Sheep, the Lost Penny, and the Prodigal Son, have all the common purpose

of showing that God rejoices over the recovery of the lost, and that in His Kingdom accordingly a different principle prevails from that which actuated the Pharisees to grumble because Christ so intimately associated with Publicans and sinners, which thing called forth these Parables (Luke 15, 1-2). The Unjust Steward, in Luke 16, 1-13, is the Jewish hierarchy who shall be deprived of their leadership in the affairs of God's Kingdom on earth (the same is the theme of the Parable found in Luke 14, 15-24); although even from these the children of light may learn a lesson (vs. 8). The Parables of the Importunate Widow, and of the Pharisee and the Publican (Luke 18, 1-14), of the Laborers in the Vineyard (Matt. 20, 1 sqq.), and others, all have some principles to impress on the disciples in reference to the work that was awaiting them —the last mentioned Parable evidently the fact, that while in the church triumphant there was to be a difference in the reward of the faithful servants (Matt. 19, 28) in answer to the question of Peter (vs. 27), in which he declares that they had done what the rich young man had refused to do (vs. 22 sqq.), there shall be no such a difference in this world, as the "penny" here means the equal opportunities of grace offered to all the children of God in the church in this world, no matter how long they may have served. The Parables all served primarily a concrete and timely purpose but with abundant opportunities of applying these principles to our own times and needs. But nothing can lead the Bible student further away from the correct understanding of the Parables than to imagine that in speaking them Christ had only abstract and academic purposes, divorced from any immediate purpose of the

Master Teacher of the world. As soon as we have discovered what Christ in each one of these picture stories wished to teach His disciples we have the Key to the Parable.

d) *Other Teachings of Christ.* While in the Sermon on the Mount and in the Parables the fact is most clearly apparent that Christ spoke and taught in the first instance for His disciples and followers, this fact is also evident in the bulk of His other teachings. These were summarized in the announcement "The Kingdom of God is at hand," declared first by John the Baptist in Matt. 3, 2, which then became the theme of Christ's own preaching (Matt. 4, 17), when taking up the work that John had been compelled to drop because of his imprisonment (Matt. 4, 1 sqq.). By this term is meant the Messianic Kingdom; and it is to be noted that in the gospels generally—though not always as is seen from Matt. 20, 28; Mark 10, 45—the royal office of the Messiah is in the forefront. This idea already underlies the application of the passages Mal. 3, 1; Is. 40, 3 to John as the forerunner of the Messiah in Matt. 3, 3; Mark 1, 2-3; Luke 1, 4-5; which means the Kingdom that comes from heaven to be established by God and is based on Dan. 7, 13-14. This term, sometimes abbreviated to "Kingdom," is, like its dogmatical equivalent "church," used in different senses. Thus the expression, "The Kingdom is at hand," designates the New Testament covenant, while in Matt. 8, 11-21 it refers to the Old Testament dispensation, and in Matt. 11, 11*b* again to that of the New Testament, and in Luke 13, 28, it is the church triumphant.

How entirely timely the teaching of Christ was is readily seen by His controversies with the hierarchy,

which dealt largely too with the authority of the oral law, or the "traditions of the fathers," the matter being explained in Mark 7, 3-4. Christ, in response to the criticism of the Pharisees that His disciples transgressed the traditions by failing to wash their hands before eating (Matt. 15, 1-2), turns on them by charging them with transgressing the written law of God—in this case the fourth commandment—in favor of the unwritten law, in their claiming that, by giving to the temple as a "gift" that with which they should support father and mother, they would be free from this express divine command (Matt. 15, 3-6; Mark 7, 8-13; Ex. 20, 12; 21, 17; Deut. 5, 12)—the last verse showing that this is but a sample of their actions. In other words, Christ appealed over the heads of His contemporaries from the oral tradition to the written Word of God.

Another phase of this controversy was the demand made by Christ for an inner service of the heart over against the purely external service of His contemporaries. This is the purpose He had in citing against them several times the passage (Hos. 6, 6) "I want mercy and not sacrifice" (cf. Matt. 9, 13; 12, 7), "mercy" or "charity" being in the gospels the highest expression of a pure and unselfish service, untainted by any expectation of a return remuneration; hence the deep significance of such terms as "doing righteousness" and its equivalent "doing alms" in Matt. 6, 1-2, and the importance of the terms expressive of such pure acts of love in the panorama of the Final Judgment (Matt. 25, 31-46; cf. also Matt. 6, 1 sqq.; John 4, 23). These particular controversies were naturally the outgrowths of the conditions of the times.

In the miracles of Christ it was also the first purpose of the Lord to influence those around Him. The miracles were never an end in themselves but only a means to an end, and this end was faith in Him as the Messiah. This is declared to be so in John 20, 30-31, although naturally they were also intended as a proof to all ages to the same effect and are already used in the Acts in this way (e. g., Acts 2, 22). We are even told that Christ on certain occasions "could not" perform any miracle because of the lack of faith (Matt. 13, 58; Mark 6, 6).

6. The Epistles. In no portion of the Scriptures, except possibly in the Old Testament prophecies, do the writers have the immediate needs of the persons for whom they write more in mind than in the Epistles. While perfectly aware of the fact that they are writing the eternal truth of God's own revelation, and confessing this conviction strongly, as in Gal. 1, 6-9; I Cor. 3, 11; 16, 22; I. Pet. 2, 4 sqq., the writers nevertheless discuss only those problems and such phases of these problems which are called for by the real needs of their readers; and not a few of the chief doctrinal teachings of the Epistles are brought out rather incidentally and in connection with the living problems and perplexities of the apostolic congregations. Thus in I Cor. 10, 16-21, one feature of the Lord's Supper, namely, that it is a communion with the body and blood of Christ, is introduced in order to warn the Corinthians against the communion that lies in idolatry. Again, the fuller account of the Supper in I Cor. 11, 23 sqq. was called forth by the fact that in Corinth this sacred rite had been abused to such an extent that some had even come in a drunken condition (cf. vs. 21*b*) from the

Agape, or lovefeast, that preceded the celebration of the Supper; and it is Paul's purpose here, not theoretically and *ex professo* to expound the doctrine of this Sacrament—this he had done years before when he preached in Corinth—but to develop those features of this doctrine which would emphasize the importance of a worthy over against an unworthy participation — hence this partial discussion of the subject. Further, in Phil. 2, 5-11 we have the *sedes doctrinae* for the doctrine of the humility of Christ, yet the introductory verses (1-4) show that this whole matter was introduced in order to emphasize the duty of humility and unity of spirit in the Philippian Christians. In II Thess. 2, 3 sqq. the doctrine of the Antichrist is elaborated, yet, as is seen from vss. 1-2, for the purpose of teaching the Thessalonians that they cannot expect the coming of the Lord in the immediate future. It must be remembered in all these and similar cases, that these doctrines themselves had been taught to the recipients of these letters long before by preaching, as this is expressly stated in II Thess. 2, 5 and 15, so that what is written is really only to supplement what had been preached and presupposes this, as indicated by the last clause in vs. 15.

The hymn of love in I Cor. 13, 1-13 was called forth by the exaggerated idea of the Corinthians concerning the "gift of tongues," which Paul, as is seen from I Cor. 14, 5 sqq.; 19, 27-29, is inclined to discourage. Hence the first clause of I Cor. 13, 1 refers to this special gift of tongues.

The strong injection of the personality of the writer, as this is especially characteristic of the Apostle Paul, and as this is also done in the Old Testament by

David and other psalmsingers in their lyrics, is only another evidence that these letters, written to particular persons and congregations to meet certain concrete conditions and circumstances, are really letters; they are *"Gelegenheitsschriften,"* notwithstanding their inspired origin and their canonical authority. The authors, while speaking with the full conviction of divine authority, have seemingly no consciousness of the fact that the revealed truths, as they are expounding them in a form adapted to meet the historic conditions of their day and date, were in the providence of God to become the permanent and official expression of these truths for the church of all ages and time; otherwise the many *personalia* in these letters, which could concern only the writers' contemporaries, such as the greetings in Rom. 16, 1 sqq. (the whole chapter), in I Cor. 16, 19-21 and elsewhere, the defense of the apostolic character of the writer even against attacks we no longer understand, as Gal. chaps. 1 and 2, and especially II Cor. 10 and following, could scarcely have been expected — notably such minor matters as the references to Paul's cloak, books and parchments in II Tim. 4, 13 and such personal statement as vs. 14. Occasionally these personal data of the writer's experience are used to teach some divine truth, as that about "the thorn in the flesh" in II Cor. 12, 7-9—where the reference is doubtlessly to a bodily ailment, possibly epilepsy. In not a few cases these personal references are not given in the first person, as in I Cor. 4, 1 sqq.; II Cor. 12, 2 sqq. Repeatedly the Apostle Paul refers to his refusal to take any remuneration for his services but claims that he earned his bread with the labor of his own hands (I Cor. 4, 12; 9, 15; Acts 18, 3; 20, 34;

I Thess. 2, 9; II Thess. 3, 8); although it is not clear why this Apostle refused to accept anything from certain congregations, even wealthy Corinth and Ephesus (he made an exception in the case of the Philippians, cf. Phil. 4, 15-17), while the other Evangelists and missionaries accepted pay even for the support of their wives (I Cor. 9, 5, which passage does not refer to the right of marriage but of asking support for a wife).

To what extent the immediate needs of the times engaged the Apostle's attention is seen from his deep concern for the collection he was raising from his Gentile congregations in Galatia, Macedonia, and Athens for the poor saints in Jerusalem, cf. Gal. 2, 10 (Acts 11, 29-30; 12, 35); I Cor. 16, 1 sqq.; II Cor. entire 8th and 9th chapters, including such interesting details as in I Cor. 16, where the Apostle states that this collection, if liberal, would be taken up to Jerusalem by himself in conjunction with a committee from Corinth, vs. 4. In several instances Paul promises to visit those to whom he writes, as Philemon, cf. vs. 22; or Phil. 1, 25; I Tim. 3, 14. Other letter-writers do the same as we read in III John vs. 10, which whole letter is quite personal. In Heb. 13, 23 the author promises to visit the recipients of this letter.

Not in all cases is the historical background of these letters clearly enough described to know exactly why certain doctrines are expounded in these writings or why they are expounded in the way they are. Thus the elaborate argument in Romans on Justification by faith alone, which is given largely in a more negative way as a refutation of the doctrine of justification by works, was doubtlessly the result of conditions prevailing in the Roman congregation, but to the present

day there is not yet a full agreement among scholars even on the question whether this congregation was predominently of Jewish or of Gentile origin. Only indirectly can at times this historical background be reconstructed from the contents of the Epistles as this is the case in James and the people to whom Hebrews is addressed. Just why the recipients of the First Epistle of John needed an elaboration of the theme, True Christian Life, is not apparent. Even to the present day we do not know for whom these letters were originally intended and only indirectly and in part what historical conditions prevailed there. And what is true of these whole letters is true of larger or smaller sections of other letters. Not a few of the special admonitions in the Pastoral Epistles, were called forth probably by dangerous Gnostic tendencies, and those in Jude and II Peter by Donatism.

7. The Prophets and their Message. What has been said of the timely and concrete historical character of the contents of the Epistles, applies equally to the prophets, who in the Old Testament were the accredited and official organs of God's inspiration exactly as were the apostles in the New Testament, and who like the latter were first of all the preachers of their own age and time, and in whose announcements the predictive element, including the Messianic promises, was more incidental and not an essential and necessary part of their work, although for us and from our viewpoint these latter features had an importance that they did not perhaps have for the contemporaries of the prophets themselves. In general this predictive Messianic element is present only in some of the literary remains of prophetic activity found in the Old Testa-

ment Canon, notably Isaiah, "the Evangelist of the Old Testament"; Zechariah, "the prophet of the Passion week"; Daniel, and in some particulars in Micah, Haggai, Malachi, etc., but not to a noteworthy degree even in the two major prophets, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and still less in the work of the non-literary prophets, particularly of those two heroic and typical prophetic figures, Elijah and Elisha, who were all primarily preachers for their own times.

In many cases the historical occasions for prophetic utterances are clearly given, even of the most important, such as the Immanuel prophecy in Is. 7, 14 sqq., called forth by the refusal of Ahaz to ask for the sign offered him by the prophet from Jehovah (cf. vs. 12-14); or the prophecy of the greater glory of the second temple in Hag. 2, 9, in consequence of the discouragement of those builders who had seen the first (cf. vs. 3, sqq.). But neither the historical occasion that called forth certain of these prophecies, nor the immediate purpose which these may have had for the prophets' original auditors (and it is unthinkable and inconsistent with the Biblical conception of prophecy that these utterances should have been academic or only for the benefit of generations living after the fulfillment and not for the people to whom the prophets spoke) is always clear. Thus the prophecy of Christ's birth in Micah 5, 1 was spoken from an historical background and what its immediate purpose was for those to whom it was first announced is also not on the surface. The final fulfillment of such predictions as those of Zech. 3, 15; 9, 9 is clear enough, but not fully what the practical object of the prophet was for his own people. The day and date of dozens of prophetic utter-

ances are given (e. g., Hag. 1, 1; 2, 1; 2, 10, 20; Zech. 1, 1; 1, 7, etc., and throughout Ezekiel), but not their historical background. Did we know this, many of these prophecies would be clearer. To understand this omission we must remember that in our prophetical books we have only meagre selections from the many addresses of the Prophets. Thus Hos. 1, 1 shows that he was active for about sixty years; yet the book bearing his name has only 14 chapters. Jonah, as is known from II Kings 14, 25, was a reputable prophet in the Northern Kingdom, yet the book bearing his name contains only one episode out of his public career. From Obadiah we have only a single chapter. There are only sixteen (or fifteen, not counting Daniel, excluded from the prophets by the Hebrew Canon) prophetical writers, or "literary prophets," represented in our Canon, and these only by parts of their works, while there had been hundreds of prophets active in the history, of whom we have no literary remains. Manifestly the prophets were first of all the messengers of God for their own people. According to what principle the selection was made from their oral utterances and embodied in the prominent literary forms in the books bearing their names, could be a matter of debate, just as could be the question, why just those of the sayings of Christ are recorded in the gospels which are actually found there. The fullest information on any one prophetic book we have in the case of Jeremiah (cf. Jer. 36, 1-4, 5-10; then vs. 22 sqq. to 32).

8. Development in the Contents of the Bible. The Bible has been a growth, not only externally in the gradual production of the books that constitute its contents, but also internally in the unfolding and ex-

pansion of the divine truths of which it constitutes the official and authoritative revelation. Taking the Bible as a whole it can be described as the record of an historical process, that of the unfolding of the Kingdom of God on earth, from its inception and foundation in the eternal purposes of God down to the objective establishment of salvation as a fact and phenomenon of history through the person and the work of Jesus Christ and to the establishment of that institution, the Church, to which has been assigned the mission of making this objective salvation the subjective possession of all mankind through the means of grace granted to the church for this purpose. The contents of the Bible thus make up a chapter, and that, too, the most important chapter in church history, namely, that which surrounds the central facts of redemption through Christ; or, what is the same, the history of the Kingdom of God on earth. The Bible is thus in the widest sense of the term a historical work, not only in the sense that it narrates the external facts of the historical unfolding of the plans of God for the salvation of man, but also in this, that in its more thetical and didactic portions, it records and repeats and reflects those revealed principles of divine truth, in faith and life, that had been revealed and realized in that stage of this development which had been at that time reached.

But where there is growth and development and expansion there are also found things new that at times take the place of things old, beyond which this historical development had already gone. This is also the case with the contents of the Bible, as is seen from the fact that the New Testament contains in doctrine and ethical principles an advancement beyond those of the Old

and some of the things of the Old are no longer authoritative. This fact is recognized in II Cor. 5, 17; Rev. 21, 5, which passages indeed refer to the individual Christian, but as expressive of what is new in Christianity historically. This is brought out more clearly in Gal. 3, 23-29. This growth and development within the Scriptures themselves appears most prominently in the relation of the Old Testament to the New. *Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet; Vetus in Novo patet,* is a great Biblical truth as it is a great hermeneutical principle. The Old Testament is the period of preparation, a preliminary revelation in the symbolism of its service and in other respects for the "fullness of time" (Eph. 1, 10; Gal. 4, 4) when Christ came into the flesh (John 1, 14); and it reached its end when Christ upon the cross uttered the word "It is finished," i. e., His work (John 19, 30). This utterance marks the close of the Old Testament Covenant, and at this point, if anywhere, begins the New Covenant; for Christ still lived and labored under the Old Covenant fulfilling its conditions of salvation. This is why John the Baptist is regarded as belonging to the Old Covenant and not to the New (Matt. 11, 11; Luke 7, 28).

But this Old Testament stage of preparation was developed under certain restrictions and limitations, not unlike those which would be used in the elementary stages of the training of an individual or of a nation (Gal. 4, 9). State and Church were united and there was no distinction between religious and civil law (hence "lawyers" in the New Testament are theologians —specialists in the Mosaic law); God gave Israel laws that determined all the details of religious and secular life, and all this for the one purpose of making the

development of this, "the chosen people," different from that of all others that surrounded them. Hence principles were established to make this independent development a possibility, conditioned and justified by the surroundings of Israel, but not compatible with the higher standards of the New Testament stage of development. One of these was the annihilation of the enemies of Israel, repeatedly enjoined upon the people in connection with the conquest of the Holy Land, and the results of which are summarized in Josh., chapters 11 and 12. What the purposes of God were in giving these commands is clearly implied in such passages as Jud. 1, 28 sqq.; 2, 2-3; Josh. 23, 13; Deut. 7, 2-5. God had assigned to Israel the high mission of becoming the bearers of salvation not only for themselves but for all mankind; and as intimate associations with these people, especially because they were ethnologically kith and kin to Israel, with common religious traditions, would be only too great a temptation for Israel to become untrue to its world-wide mission, the eradication of these people was ordered by God on the same principle that a surgeon may amputate a diseased finger or hand in order to save a life. Saul was even rejected as king because he had failed to comply with this command (I Sam. 15, 18-19). To speak in this connection of Jehovah as a "cruel" and bloodthirsty" God, as is done by radical Bible critics, is entirely to misunderstand the historical situation.

The same disciplinary and precautionary measures were recorded too in the legal code of the Old Testament to protect the people from religious disintegration from within, and death was decreed to transgressors for many violations, including heresy (e. g., Gen. 17, 14;

Ex. 12, 15, 19; 30, 33; 31, 14; Lev. 7, 21-25; 18, 29; 20, 17; 20, 18; Num. 19, 20). The destruction of Korah and his followers by God Himself (Num. 16 32; 26, 10; Eccles. 45, 22) is an illustration of this rule. Had Christ really been guilty of heresy in claiming to be the Son of God, His execution would have been justifiable according to the Old Testament law.

Naturally in the New Testament the first of these two features falls away altogether since the Kingdom of God was no longer developed within the limitations of one nation and people, but this particularism had given way to an international universality; and in addition, the outward "hedge of the law," which Jehovah had erected around and about Israel, had in the New Testament made way for that Spirit which from within accomplishes these purposes of the Church. And to illustrate this difference attention need be drawn only to a passage like Tit. 3, 10, where heresy brings with it no longer death, but only being discarded by the believers (cf. II John 10; II Thess. 3, 6; Rom. 16, 17; Matt. 7, 15).

In the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5, 21-48) Christ discusses in detail a number of higher principles of the New Testament covenant which have taken the place of some announced in the old, especially as interpreted by the theology of His day. In vss. 21-26 at the hand of the Fifth Commandment He shows that the merely external interpretation of the Law, as maintained by the superficial ideas of the Jewish hierarchy, must now give way to deeper conceptions of heart observance, as is clearly stated in I John 3, 15. Practically the same is done in regard to the Sixth Commandment (vss. 27-30). In vss. 31-32 Christ clearly

announces that He even goes beyond the Old Testament teachings themselves on the subject of divorce, as declared in Deut. 24, 1, which did actually permit a man to divorce his wife if he found anything "unclean" in her. In Matt. 19, 3-9 this matter becomes the subject of discussion between Christ and the Pharisees, and in vs. 8 Christ acknowledges that Moses did permit divorce on other grounds than the only one which He will recognize, but adds that this was done "because of the hardness of your hearts," and also declares that this was not in harmony with the original purposes of God, as expressed in Gen. 1, 27 sqq.—i. e., it was a concession made by God to existing conditions and did not conform to His original ideals. Christ here admits that the actual law on divorce as found in the Pentateuch, was not yet a perfect realization of the ideal in God's mind, and that in this respect the Law cannot yet be called perfect. In regard to no other law is such a difference between the ideal and the real in the Old Testament actually taught. In Ex. 21, 24 sqq.; Lev. 24, 20 the law of personal retaliation (lex talionis) is plainly taught, but Christ here sets up a new principle of non-retaliation, for what is stated in vs. 29 sqq. is to be taken as meaning that a person should rather submit to a double injustice than to retaliate a single time. The matter of the oath (vss. 33-37) is plainly taught in Ex. 20, 7; Lev. 24, 16; Deut. 23, 21. In condemning the oath altogether in Matt. 5, 34, it must be remembered that Christ is here giving direction, not to the world in general, but specifically to His disciples, and among them an oath is not permissible. Accordingly an ordination or confirmation "oath" would be a violation of the teaching of Christ, but it was no viola-

tion of these when He himself took an oath before the civil authorities (Matt. 26, 63-64). In Matt. 5, 43 sqq. Christ inculcates the important innovation of a forgiveness even of our enemies; and in this passage the expression, "Thou shalt hate thine enemies," is not found in the Old Testament but was evidently a conclusion drawn by Pharisaic dogmatics. The doctrine of forgiveness between man and man was something quite new for the disciples, although the Old Testament clearly taught that God forgives sinful man (Ps. 32, 1-2; 130, 4; Is. 33, 24; Dan. 9, 9; Mark 1, 4); but the Old Testament was not considered as enjoining upon man to forgive his brother (but is possibly implied in Gen. 45, 5), much less his enemy, except that this is contained in the general command of loving the neighbor as oneself. It is significant that Christ in Matt. 6, 14 comments only on one petition in the Lord's Prayer, namely, on the duty to forgive, and this is the only petition given in a conditional form. In Luke 11, 4 this relation is expressed even more strongly ("because"). The new doctrine of the forgiveness of sins among men seemed so strange to the disciples that in Matt. 18, 21-27 Peter brings up this question again in order to learn how far his duty in this respect goes; and in Luke 17, 4 the same answer is given and in vs. 5 the Apostles ask for more faith in order to meet its requirements.

One of the matters that became clear through the providential guidance of the Apostolic Church, rather than by any direct declarations of Christ, was the fact that these limitations and restrictions in the Law, which were in force in the period of the preparation and na-

tional particularism in the Old Testament Church, had now ceased to be in force and had given way to a new higher spiritual liberty. Christ Himself, as far as the reports in the gospels are concerned, had seemingly said nothing to His disciples on this subject, and His violation and that of His followers of the "traditions of the Fathers," had to do only with the oral and not with the Mosaic law; on the contrary, He insisted He would observe the slightest minutiae of the Law (Matt. 5, 17), without making any distinction between the passing and the permanent feature of this Law. This great fact evidently belonged to that body of truth into which the Comforter was to guide them, whom He would send from the Father (John 14, 16, 26; 15, 26). This was then too one of the great truths that only gradually dawned upon the Apostles, as is apparent from the story of the conversion of Cornelius in Acts 10, 1 sqq. and from the deliberations of the Apostolic Convention (Acts 15, 19, 24 sqq.). The conversion of the Gentiles in Antioch (Acts 11, 21) and the phenomenal success of Barnabas and Paul on the First Missionary Tour (as reported in Acts 13 and 14), made the problem of the conditions under which the Gentiles would enter into the church a burning question for the Apostolic Church, and led to the great convention described in Acts 15, 1 sqq. What is really the greatest work that the Apostle Paul did is this, that he succeeded in having adopted those principles which alone made mission work among the Gentiles possible. In a summary way this same Apostle declares in Col. 2, 16 (Rom. 14, 2-4) the freedom from the ceremonial law in general. The New Testament nowhere explicitly declares which parts and portions of the Old Testament law are no longer

in force. The distinction between the moral and the ceremonial law is a theological and not a Biblical one; it is a material and not a formal difference. In the Old Testament such a distinction could not have been made because all of the legal code was equally authoritative. To the present day theologians are not in perfect agreement as to certain things, whether they belong to the moral or the ceremonial law, e. g., the setting aside of one day out of seven for the worship of God (Ex. 20, 9-10); the marriage with a deceased wife's sister. It is perhaps unfortunate that the term "ceremonial" is used to designate those laws and institutions which are no longer in force, as this term was usually confined to the Levitical cultus and its service. In fact also social, political, economic and other laws that pertained to the historical development of Israel are also included in this class.

That this development and expansion depicted in the Scriptures implies also the gradual unfolding with greater clearness and a large abundance of details of the great doctrines of faith, goes without saying and is one of the first things that is impressed on the mind of the Bible reader. There was no change in the plan of salvation, but this plan in its contents was gradually made clearer and clearer through divine revelation. This unity of the divine plan is clearly taught in Gal. 3, 15-22, and strictly speaking we should not speak of two covenants at all but of two stages in the development of the one covenant. It is therefore not wise to find in the earlier stages of this revelation the full truth that only came to light in the later, as is done, e. g., when in Gen. 1, 26 is seen evidence of the doctrine of the Trinity more explicitly than of a plurality of persons,

Property of
Catourette Library

or in Gen. 4, 1 of the divinity of the promised Messiah, Gen. 3, 15. The divinity of Christ is indeed taught in the Old Testament, as the Lord expressly shows in His argument with the Pharisees (Matt. 22, 41-46; Mark 12, 35-37; Luke 20, 41-44), drawing His conclusion from Ps. 110, 1 (Heb. 10, 12-13), but only in general outline, as are many other doctrines, such as the universality of the Kingdom of God in Gen. 13, 16; 15, 5, etc. The whole Levitical service and rites are but shadows of the things to come (Col. 2, 17; Heb. 8, 5; 10, 1). The "truth," i. e., the reality and substance, came in Jesus Christ (John 1, 14, 17; Rom. 10, 4).

And what is true in matters of doctrine is also true in matters of conduct and principles of ethics, namely, that God passed over without criticism certain actions and sayings of representative men of the Old Testament covenant, which did not comply with the divine command, such as Abraham's relation to Hagar and his falsehoods, Jacob's theft of his brother's blessing, David's and Solomon's sins. The Imprecatory Psalms, in which the singer virtually curses his enemies, such as Ps. 35, 8, 26-28; 69, 22-29; 109, 7-15, are not Christian in spirit but are expressions of the religious feelings natural at the stage of development reached when uttered by these men, and permitted or suffered "because of the hardness of their hearts," but not given as a model and an ensample for the clearer and more spiritual faith of later ages.

But all this does not mean that God had at different times different standards of right. In both the Old and the New Testament period the divine ideal is the same as summed up in Matt. 22, 36-38; Deut. 6, 5; 10, 12, namely, love of God and love of our fellows,

which latter Christ declares is the equal of the former (cf. Lev. 19, 18; Mark 12, 30-31; Luke 10, 25 sqq.; Micah 6, 8). There has been no change in the divine ideal for man's conduct, but there has been a gradual growth in the realization of this ideal. Thus the giving of the Law four hundred years after the establishment of the covenant made no change (Gal. 3, 17).

In the New Testament too there is only such gradual realization of the divine ideal. It is a noteworthy fact that neither Christ nor the Apostles give a code of particular commands dealing with the political, social, and kindred duties. They insist only on one thing, namely, a new heart (Eph. 4, 22 sqq.; Rom. 12, 2) and from this source, a regenerated heart, is to spring a regenerated life in all directions. The New Testament is by no means a new legal code, or a new Law. Thus the New Testament does not expressly forbid slavery; and Paul even sends back the slave Onesimus to his master Philemon and does not ask for his manumission, but only that he be treated as a Christian brother (cf. Epistle to Philemon); and yet now the Christians of all lands have reached the conviction that slavery is incompatible with the law of love for one another. The New Testament nowhere expressly forbids polygamy (possibly in I Cor. 7, 2), except in case of pastors (I Tim. 3, 2; Tit. 1, 6-7), but this too is a truth into the recognition of which the Christian Church has grown, that polygamy is contrary to the original order in God's creation. That, in accordance with the principles enunciated in I Cor. 8, 13, the Christian Church may yet recognize as duties things not yet clear as such, is not an impossibility.

9. The Historical Method of Interpretation. The origin and genesis, the character and contents of the Biblical books, all combine to show that the historical method is the correct way of determining what these books in their entirety and in all their constituent elements purpose to impart. Not indeed in this sense that historical conditions and facts produced the contents of these writings — for these contents are of the Spirit both in so far as the historical development itself is concerned, of which they are the official records and also these records themselves — for this would make the religion of the Bible a naturalistic product and scheme and only the story of what the religious instincts and feelings of Israel brought forth; but in this sense, that these contents were developed under historical conditions that gave form and shape to the revelations contained in this Word and also had a determining influence on the selection of those materials which are actually contained in the Bible. The Bible student who can put himself into the actual condition of the men who wrote these books, not only into the external surroundings of time, place and other circumstances, but also into the mental trend and spirit of the authors, and also into their spiritual status, is best equipped to interpret the thought which they have penned. The interpreter's business is to reproduce, and the more he has at his command all those factors that were combined when the thought was originally produced, the more successful he will be.

The application of this method of interpretation to the Scriptures varies in different parts and according to the kinds of data found in the Scriptures, being dependent upon the degree to which the historical back-

ground of the author that originally influenced his writing can be reproduced. In some portions, and these really the most important of all, this principle can find practically no application at all. The great fundamental truths of the plan of salvation are in every particular the product of absolute revelation and hence are not conditioned by historical surroundings. What the Scriptures tell us about God and His highest attributes, particularly of the central attribute in His relation to man, namely Love, and His Fatherhood through Jesus Christ; further of the eternal plan of salvation that originated in all eternity in this wonderful love; of the objective realization of this plan, both as to its character and its historical unfolding, through Jesus Christ; of the subjective appropriation of this salvation in man and in mankind through the operations of the Holy Ghost, together with the results of this appropriation in Christian life — all these and kindred matters in their deepest meanings are independent of all historical setting and background, and are to be understood just as they have been made known to us. They are truths of revelation, pure and simple, and passages like John 1, 1-18; 3, 5 and indeed the chief contents of the Fourth Gospel and of Paul's great argument for justification by faith alone in the first eight chapters of Romans can, as far as the material contents of the thought are concerned, receive no light from the historical background.

It is, however, noteworthy that not a few of these transcendental and revealed thoughts can receive accuracy of interpretation only by noting the conditions under which they were originally spoken. Thus not a few of the seemingly purely abstract statements of the

Sermon on the Mount can only be appreciated in their original intent when the whole discussion is understood as an anti-Pharisaic exposition of the deeper purposes of the Law and intended to win and wean away the disciples from the influence of that school of theology. Thus the prohibition to judge, in Matt. 7, 1 sqq., together with the following thoughts, is specifically directed against the harsh criticisms as practiced by the Pharisees — the same is true of Matt. 7, 15-20.

The more abstract a Bible book is, the less this historical principle can be applied in its interpretation. Thus the problem of the book of Job, namely, the theodicy, or the vindication of God for permitting His own faithful to suffer, can be and has been discussed under any historical surroundings. So little can this principle be applied here, that this book can be equally well interpreted from the standpoint of the Mosaic, or the Davidic, or the post-exilic periods. For several of the New Testament Epistles, the contents of the Acts furnish a good but meagre background that can be utilized in the interpretation of these letters. Thus Paul's experiences in Thessalonica, as described in Acts 17, 1-10, enable us to understand why in the first part of his first Epistle to the Thessalonians he should seek to comfort the recipients because they were persecuted. On the other hand, the extensive account of Paul's experiences at Philippi (Acts 16, 12-20) offer little or no help for the interpretation of Philippians, and the same is true but to a less degree of the account of Paul's stay at Corinth (Acts 18, 1-18) for the letters to the Corinthians, although the special statement (Acts 18, 3), to the effect that Paul engaged in his trade in Corinth with Aquila and Priscilla, explains the state-

ment in I Cor. 4, 12 and the argument in I Cor. 9, 1 sqq. Such data can, however, in certain cases be secured from extra-Biblical sources. Thus the fact that the verb κορινθιάζομαι means to commit whoredom and the noun κορινθιαστής, one who commits whoredom, enables one to understand better I Cor. 5, 1. For a number of the Pauline Epistles the Acts give nothing that could be used for the reconstruction of this historical background, as, e. g., Colossians. Indeed it is this lack of information on such a background that perplexes us in many of the Epistles, thus e. g., in all the Catholic letters. Did we, e. g., know who are meant by the "rich," in James 5, 1-6, we would be able to determine whether this pericope is addressed rhetorically to rich persons outside the congregation or refers to such oppressors in the congregation. So little, again, is known of the historical background that called forth this Epistle of James, that scholars are all at sea in hunting for the recipients of this letter, some seeking the "twelve tribes in the Dispersion" or Jewish Diaspora (James 1, 1) here and others there. The same is true of the Epistle to the Hebrews, although this letter contains a number of details concerning the condition of the congregation or congregations to whom it was sent, but who cannot be located. Those Biblical books which have to the greatest degree concrete contents, i. e., historical, geographical, archaeological and kindred elements, profit most by this method, but just how much, will depend on the material available for this purpose from other sources. Sometimes expectations are disappointed in this respect. The Egyptian parallels to the concluding chapters of Genesis and the opening chapters of Exodus are comparatively meagre

and of little value; the cuneiform parallels to the story of creation, the deluge (significantly there are none to the Fall), to the period of the Patriarchs, to that of the Kings, found in Babylonian literature are much more extensive and in many respects valuable. Thus it has been a source of satisfaction to find in these sources the Chedorlaomer of Gen. 14, 4, 9, 17 mentioned as an historical person. Any real benefit, however, to the interpreter of the Scriptures except in externals cannot be expected, especially as these extra-Biblical parallels are often, as, e. g., in the story of Creation and the deluge, saturated with degenerate polytheism, forming a strong contrast to the purely Monotheistic account in the Bible; or they are one-sided misrepresentations of the actual occurrences, as is the cuneiform story of the Assyrian capture of Samaria.

The portion of the Scriptures that profits most by the historical method are probably the gospels; and a leading savant, who declared that Palestine, i. e., the knowledge of history, character and details of the Holy Land, was a "fifth gospel," i. e., furnished for interpretation materials equivalent to an additional gospel, was correct. The Land and the Book belong together and interpret each other. Naturally the three Synoptic gospels are more favored in this regard than is the Fourth, as the contents of this book are much more abstract; but in the case of the former group it is almost a general rule that the historical background of facts or of thought adds to the clearness of the passage. Examples can be selected almost at random. Thus the direction given to the Seventy (Luke 10, 4*b*) to greet none on the way, simply emphasizes the zeal in the

Lord's business, which is not to be interrupted by the ceremonies and time-robbing greetings often found in the East. The command to wash one another's feet after the example of humility set by Christ (John 13, 14) is based on the fact that in the Orient this is the work of the most menial servant. The washing of Christ's feet by the woman in Bethany (Mary, John 12, 3; Matt. 26, 6-13; Mark 14, 3-9), can be understood as an act not interfering with the meal when it is remembered that the Jews did not sit but lie at the table. The same is true of the similar (not the same) event recorded in Luke 7, 37 sqq. All the terms used in the New Testament concerning eating at the table in the original say "lying at table." This explains the statement in John 13, 25-26 according to which John was "lying on the bosom of Jesus," i. e., was lying in the place just in front of the Lord, his head, as it were, on the bosom of the Lord. This makes possible that the answer given by Jesus in John 13, 26*b* was not heard by the others at the table. Thus the expression about Lazarus lying on the bosom of Abraham (Luke 14, 23) expresses only the intimate relationship between the two. The same is true of the more general statement of lying down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the Kingdom of God (Matt. 8, 11), i. e., being members of that Kingdom. The same is true of Luke 14, 15. The fact that Ananias had been buried before his wife Sapphira knew of his death (Acts 5, 7), is the need of haste in disposing of the dead in the Orient. In the case of Christ too the burial took place within three hours after His death, although in this case it was hastened by the approach of the Sabbath. The fact that, in Matt. 10, 35; Luke 12, 53, mention is

made of the daughter-in-law and the mother-in-law, but not the son-in-law, is because according to oriental custom a woman in being married severs her connection with her own family and becomes a member of her husband's family. Christ sends out the Seventy, two and two (Luke 10, 1), because of the danger of traveling singly, as is evidenced by the example of the man who fell among the thieves (Luke 10, 30).

An interesting example of how the world of thought, historical and otherwise, that is back of a Biblical expression, may affect the meaning of this term, is seen in the word "name." Unlike the modern usage, where the name of a person may have nothing to do with his character, in ancient times this latter was generally the case. Thus Pliny (7, 9, 7) reports that Caesar received this name "a caeso matris utero"; and Paul, the Greek name of the Apostle of the Gentiles, was probably given him because of his diminuative size. Among the Jews the close relationship between the person bearing a name with a special signification as expressive of the importance of that person in the Kingdom of God can be illustrated by many examples. The name Cain was given to the first born of Eve, according to Gen. 4, 1, because she had "acquired" him from the Lord, hence Cain equals Acquisition. Three times we are told, in Gen. 17, 18; 18, 12; 21, 6, that in connection with the promise of Isacc the recipient "laughed," once Abraham and twice Sarah. Isaac is a verbal formation from the root that signifies to laugh. According to Gen. 17, 5 and 15 the name of Abram was changed to Abraham and Sarai to Sarah for theocratical purposes. In Gen. 32, 28 Jacob is given the name Israel for similar reasons. In I Sam.

4, 21 (cf. Ruth 1, 20) the name of Ichabod is given by the daughter-in-law of Eli to her new-born son, as expressive of the collapse of Israel's glory (the name signifies "Where is the glory?"). Isaiah (7, 3 and 8, 3) had two sons, whose names "Shear-jashub" (i. e., the Remnant shall return") and "Maher-shalal-hash-baz" (Speedy booty, hasty plunder) had prophetic significance, as is indicated by the interpretation of the latter name (Is. 8, 4). Between these two is found the famous Immanuel passage (Is. 7, 14; cf. 8, 8, 10), which in its significance for the contemporaries of the prophet signified the speedy advent of deliverance against the enemies, while according to Matt. 1, 23 it signified too the birth of the Messiah from a virgin. In Hos. 1, 4, 6, 9 mention is made of three children of the prophet, two sons and one daughter, who all received prophetic names. In Luke 1, 13 (cf. 59-66) the name of John is announced as the name of the promised son of Zacharias and Elizabeth, as indicated by vs. 15, because he shall be great before the Lord, i. e., render an important service in the progress of the Kingdom of God, as is expressly recognized by Christ (Matt 11, 9 sqq.; Luke 7, 26 sqq.). Similar reasons underlie the name of Jesus as the personal appellation of the coming Redeemer (Luke 1, 31); and the statement of the next verse says, "he shall be called" the Son of the Most High, i. e., shall be in reality that which this name signifies, showing the identity of the name with the character and work of Him who bears this name. In Mark 3, 16 we are told that it was Christ who gave to Simon the surname Peter, and in Matt. 16, 18 we are told that this was done because of the firm character of his confession of the divinity of the Master. Passages abound

to show this relationship of the name of the person to what they are in the Kingdom of God, e. g., Apoc. 3, 1; Mark 5, 9; Phil. 2, 9; Heb. 1, 3, 4; Eph. 1, 21, and many others (see Cremer N. T. Lexicon under ὄνομα).

On the basis of these and similar facts we can understand why Christ repeatedly declares that only the prayers in His name can expect an answer, e. g., John 14, 13; 16, 23, 24; Mark 11, 24; Matt. 7, 7; Luke 11, 9-13 (He is speaking here only to His disciples), and yet in the Prayer which He taught His followers (Matt. 6, 9-13; Luke 11, 2-4), His name is not even mentioned. Praying in the name of Christ does not mean to use his name in prayer (for this could be done even for sinful purposes, Matt 7, 22-23), but to put our faith and confidence for an answer in that work of redemption which He who bears this name has accomplished; which faith is implied in the term "Father," as according to Matt. 11, 27, only he can truthfully utter this who through Christ has experienced the Fatherhood of God. It is only the Christian who can pray the Lord's Prayer as it was understood in the mind of Christ, who taught it only to the disciples.

The same group of facts explains what is meant when Christ directs the Apostles to baptize "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. 28, 19; Mark 16, 15-16). This does not mean the employment of these three names in this rite, but it signifies that the baptismal blessings depend on what those three persons of the Godhead have accomplished for the salvation of the one baptized. It signifies rather the basis of the baptismal grace and with this too as a resultant purpose, a communion with the Triune God.

It is from this same historical standpoint that the question as to the bearing of the Biblical data on the subject of baptism should be approached, rather than from the purely philological. John's baptism was not something absolutely new and is not described as such in the New Testament, but was evidently regarded as a form of Levitical washing (cf. Lev. 14, 8-9; 15, 5-11; 16-27; 17, 15; 15, 13; 16, 4, 24, 28; Num. 19, 7, 19; Ex. 12, 10; 29, 4). These Levitical rites consisted in actual washings and cleansing, and the identity of the two terms is clear from a comparison of Matt. 15, 2 with Mark 7, 4, and Luke 11, 38. (In the second and third cases the verb *βαπτίζομαι* is used, but not in the first). The figurative use of this verb also connotes the idea of overwhelming, or covering. Thus in Mark 10, 39 the baptism referred to is the overwhelming sufferings awaiting the Master in His impending passion, which appear both from the correlated fact in the preceding verse speaking of the cup He is to drink, and also from the fact that in the parallel passage in Matt. 20, 22 (in good texts) only the latter thought is mentioned, but nothing is said about "baptism." In Luke 11, 38 the word rendered "washed" in the original is "baptized" and the regular verbs for washing are used in the parallel passages (Matt. 15, 2; Mark 7, 2, 5). Washing in the Orient is generally done by pouring water over the hands and thus covering them.

The New Testament passages that refer to the administration of baptism, either by the Baptist or by Christ's Apostles, do not definitely settle the question as to the mode of administration, but incline to the idea of immersion. It is not safe to draw any conclusions from those statements that John baptized "in water,"

or "by water" (Matt. 3, 11; John 1, 26-27; Acts 1, 5), as these state merely the means of baptism, it being unsafe always to give to the preposition ἐν a local meaning, as it combines both after the manner of the Hebrew preposition בְּ . The same is true of the expression "into" (εἰς) the Jordan (cf. the parallel construction, I Cor. 10, 2, where the expression by a cloud and by the sea unto Moses is expressed by ἐν with the dative). More directly such a passage as John 3, 23, where it is said that John selected Enon on the Jordan as a place for baptism because there was much water there, and the baptism of the Eunuch from Ethiopia by Philip (Acts 8, 36-39), point rather to immersion, while the baptism of the three thousand in Acts 2, 41 leaves the matter undecided, since among other things, the passage does not say that these were all baptized on identically the same day, while the baptism of the jailor in Philippi (Acts 16, 33) does not state where this baptism took place. Indeed if the matter of the mode of baptism were a matter of importance, or the amount of water used — which is not the case — the historical evidences back of the rite, connected with the Levitical washings of the Old Testament just as historically as the Passover is connected with the Lord's Supper, would speak for immersion rather than sprinkling as the mode of administering in New Testament times. Indeed sprinkling would be the innovation.

Closely connected with this problem is another dealing with baptism that is relieved of some difficulty by a proper consideration of the historical background. At first glance it seems as though the theoretical teachings on the subject of baptism found in the New Testament, according to which baptismal grace and regeneration

are the great blessings resulting from this sacrament (John 3, 5; Gal. 3, 29; Tit. 3, 7), are not in harmony with the actual practice of the Apostolic Church where baptism was administered only after regeneration had been effected through the Word. Already in the case of John the Baptist, the rite was administered after repentance (Matt. 3, 6; Mark 1, 5); also in the case of thousands of converts on the first Pentecost in Jerusalem (Acts 2, 38, 41); also in the case of the Eunuch (Acts 8, 36-39); and that of Cornelius (Acts 10, 47-48); and of the jailor in Philippi (Acts 16, 30-34). In all these cases the function of baptism was not to create faith and regeneration but only to seal that already created by the oral word. In addition there is no clear example of infant baptism, where this rite could have created faith, found in the New Testament, not even in Acts 16, 33, or I Cor. 1, 16. The solution of the difficulty is doubtlessly this, that in all cases regeneration is effected by the Word and that normally this is to be done by the Word connected with baptism; as also that normally the Church is to be recruited by infants born again after the manner taught in the thetical teachings of the New Testament on this subject (for which reason John 3, 5 is to be regarded as the ordinary rule), but that, as a matter of fact, in the Apostolic Church the method of recruiting the church was the abnormal way, through the accession of adults. What to us and according to the Biblical conception of baptism is the extraordinary way was in the Apostolic Age the ordinary, and vice versa.

10. How to Apply the Scriptures. Naturally there can be no question of "applying" the great truths

of salvation as these are revealed in the Scriptures; they are not to be "applied" but to be appropriated by faith and made a part of our spiritual self. We can apply only those passages of Scripture which speak of conduct and can do so by being guided by what these passages say. Application of Scriptures is thus purely a practical matter.

Again, the mere fact that a certain condition or status prevailed in the church even in the New Testament age is no occasion for our following this Biblical precedent. Thus already in the Apostolic Church in Jerusalem there existed a communion of earthly possessions (Acts 4, 32-37), but this particular method of exhibiting the brotherly love adopted by these earliest Christians is not binding on the church now, however much the spirit that prompted this innovation certainly is. In the early Christian Church, as evidenced particularly by I Cor. 12, 1 sqq., there existed great informality of worship in the public services, each member employing his special gifts for the good of all. As nearly all these gifts are no longer in possession of the church, it would be even an impossibility to follow the example of these early Christians, and at the same time it is evident that a complete revival of the Apostolic Church in its peculiarities is out of the question in our day and age.

Further, we find in the Scriptures many sermons and discourses delivered by the prophets of old to their contemporaries and by the Apostles to theirs and even one quite extensively reproduced of Christ Himself in the Sermon on the Mount. Yet the Christian Church in its methods of preaching has not followed the precedent of the Lord, nor of the Apostles, nor of

the Prophets. The homiletical rules of the Church have grown rather in Greek than in Biblical soil.

The principles of Christian conduct as these are found in the Scriptures are given in nearly all cases in the form of concrete cases and in certain historical settings. The way to apply these lessons to the problems and perplexities of our own day is to separate the underlying principles that are embedded in the concrete cases mentioned in the Bible and then to adapt and adjust the principles thus laid bare to present conditions. In each and every case it is necessary to understand the original purpose and spirit of a passage even if these words and expressions do not from a modern standpoint say the same as they do from that of the original writers. It is actually possible that the literal application of a Scripture injunction would be a misapplication of this passage. The word as understood by us and the spirit of a passage may be quite contrary, and not infrequently is the basis of heretical sects and sectlets. Thus in John 13, 14 Christ in so many words directs the disciples that they should wash each other's feet as He has washed theirs. As that work was in His day assigned to the most menial of servants, His action was a remarkable indication of His humility, as He Himself states. In our day the spirit of His action would not find its fulfillment in the literal reproduction of the act itself, but in other ways.

When Paul in I Cor. 16, 2 directs the readers on each Lord's Day to lay aside a certain sum, the application does not demand that we literally follow the words of this direction, which was given in reference to a particular case, namely, to have ready a collection for the poor saints in Jerusalem for him when he would

come to Corinth. Applied to us this apostolic injunction calls for systematic preparation for the needs of the Church, but we need not adopt the special system that he recommends to the Corinthians.

In seeking to discover the applicability of the underlying principle of certain concrete cases, it is of prime importance to learn if certain commands or directions were given because of the peculiar conditions of the times, or because of divine truth as such. In the former case the application of a passage is relative; in the latter absolute. In I Cor. 11, 5, 13 it is expressly forbidden that a woman shall appear in the public services with uncovered head; and the reason given is not that this is based on a divine command, but that this is disgraceful conduct, this being the case because it was contrary to the idea of modesty of the times and was resorted to by women of easy morals in order to attract attention to their charms even with a view to violating the sixth commandment. This fundamental principle that there should be no immodest exhibition of woman's charms is still in force, but the appearance of women in public with uncovered head no longer has this purpose. Immodesty and temptation to sin on the part of women show themselves now in a different way from what they did in the days of St. Paul, and a direct application of the Pauline command is no longer in place.

The situation is different in the direction given by the same Apostle that women are to keep silent in the Church (I Cor. 14, 34-35; I Tim. 2, 12; (Gen. 3, 16;) I Cor. 11, 3; Eph. 5, 23; Tit. 2, 5). In both of these chief passages it is stated that this is because of an order and arrangement of God, according to which

woman is subject to man. The application is accordingly direct, the first passage stating that this means they are not to "speak" in the congregations, the latter that they are not to "teach," or what is the same "preach," the same word being used in the second passage (διδάσκω) that is also employed in the Great Commission (Matt. 28, 20). But how far the limitations and restrictions of women go beyond the express prohibition of preaching, must be determined by the Analogy of Scriptures on this particular subject. It cannot be an absolute prohibition of all participation by use of the voice on the part of women in the public services, for it is the express teaching of Paul that in all spiritual matters there is a perfect equality of rights also in the church between the sexes as between nations (Gal. 3, 28; Rom. 10, 12; I Cor. 12, 13; Acts 10, 34; 15, 9). In addition, it is expressly stated that in the Apostolic Church there were "prophetesses" (Acts 21, 9; cf. Acts 2, 17 on the basis of Joel 3, 1 sqq.); and in I Cor. 11, 5 it is described as a fact that women did pray and prophecy in the Corinthian congregation — whether with an implied censure of the thing itself or with the understanding that this and similar cases were exceptions, is not stated.

In the application of this concrete case to our own times it must be determined when the "speaking" in the church that is forbidden to women ends and where the spiritual equality of man and woman begins. If spiritual equality is expressly given to women, would not then all those things too which are necessary to the exercise of this spiritual equality, such as participation in determining the confessional status of a congregation, the hours and frequency of worship, in calling

of a pastor, and even in voting on matters of vital interest to the spiritual prosperity of the church, be included in this equality which is the right of women in the church? And then, is the mere possibility of women opposing the view of the men in congregational affairs necessarily to be regarded as a usurpation of the position of man as the head of the woman, which itself really is restricted to the family relationship? Such an opposition could readily be the outcome of spiritual superiority on the part of the women.

In Jas. 1, 27 we are told a pure and undefiled religion before God consists in this to "visit the widows and orphans in their affliction." As the widows and the orphans were in the social conditions of the Bible lands the most helpless of the helpless, it was possible in their case to realize Christ's ideal of true worship, namely, a service without the slighest expectation of a return service, better than in any other class of the needy. The application of this principle in our days would probably not demand special attention just to these two classes, for whom often ample provisions are made by church and state, but to other classes for whom no such provisions have been made. The word "visit" here is one of those which in the Biblical language imply an attitude and action of the heart too, and hence is equivalent to "help" (cf. Deut. 24, 17; Job 29, 13; Prov. 15, 25; Matt. 23, 14; Mark 12, 43; Eccles. 35, 18).

The Biblical command to exercise hospitality, found in Rom. 12, 13; Heb. 13, 2; I Pet. 4, 9 (I Tim. 3, 2; Tit. 1, 8; Deut. 10, 19), is largely based on oriental conditions but does not imply that under changed modern conditions the duty of loving our brother as our-

selves must find its expression in a special way just in this manner, but may in others.

In I Cor. 8, 13 the Apostle closes a lengthy discussion of the question, whether it was right to eat of the meat of animals sacrificed to the idols, and which he had answered as an abstract proposition of Christian right and privilege in the affirmation vss. 1-6, with a decided and emphatic declaration that he would not "in all eternity eat such meat" if by doing so he would cause a brother to stumble or to fall. This problem itself in its original form has disappeared from the life of the church but the principle of conduct that the Apostle enunciates must still be applied to modern conditions. We may have the liberty to do certain things, but the consideration for the spiritual condition of a brother may make it imperative not to make use of this liberty; for Christian liberty implies not only the right to do something in the case of adiaphora but also the right to refrain from doing something. Thus, e. g., the Christian's relation to the drink problem would be an application of the principle implied in Paul's treatment of the meat problem.

The application of Biblical commands to modern conditions is often difficult. Every instance of an application is in a certain way a comparison and the application goes only so far as the *tertium comparationis,* which is often a matter of uncertainty. Thus the question, how far the religious syncretism forbidden by the First Commandment is applicable to modern secret orders, will depend on the degree of evidence that can in each case be furnished that certain secret orders practice such syncretism. Sometimes this common point of agreement is different from what might be

expected. Thus in Matt. 16, 6 Christ warns against the leaven of the Pharisees, which in Luke 12, 1 (probably in an explanatory note of the Evangelist himself) is declared to be hypocrisy, in harmony with the statements of Matt. 23, 13 sqq.; Luke 11, 52; yet in this case (Matt. 16, 12) it is stated epexegetically that Christ here referred to their doctrines. In applying this Bibical term "Pharisee" to modern conditions special caution is accordingly necessary.

CHAPTER III

The Divine and the Human Factors in the Scriptures

1. The Divine Factor. That the composition of the Biblical books is the result of the co-operation of a divine and of a human factor is expressly taught in that *locus classicus* — II Pet. 1, 21. Here it is clearly stated that the holy men of God spake—or what would be the same "wrote"—these productions, but that they did so under the impulse and inspiration of the Holy Ghost. The fact of inspiration is here taught as plainly as language can do so, but no theory as to the manner of inspiration beyond the statement that what is found in these books is the result of the co-operation of two agencies, God and man, who worked together in their production, is given. It is true that this passage, as in the case also with the kindred passage, namely, II Tim, 3, 16, refers primarily to the Old Testament; but in principle it applies to the New Testament also, for what brought about the inspiration of the former was also an active agent in the production of the latter.

There is to be found in the Scripture only one exception to this co-operation, namely, the composition of the Ten Commandments, which are expressly and repeatedly declared to have been the work of God Himself. Cf. Ex. 31, 18; 32, 16; Deut. 9, 10; 10, 4 (but cf. Ex. 34, 28; Deut. 4, 13). It is a noteworthy fact that in the two places where these commandments are given, namely, Ex. 20, 1-17 and Deut. 5, 6-22 the *verba*

ipsissima of God are not given in verbatim agreement, but with considerable variations in detail. Thus in the Third Commandment (according to the Augustinian division) the introductory verbs in the two cases are different and the motive assigned for the observation of the day of rest in Deut. 5, 15 is quite different from that found in Ex. 20, 9-11. Again, what is the Ninth Commandment in Exodus is a part of the Tenth in Deuteronomy, and the opening clause of the Tenth in the former is the Ninth Commandment in the latter. Then there are two different words used for "covet" in Deut., while the same word is used in both cases in Exodus.

This diversity in the reproduction of the very words of Jehovah is quite in harmony with the general custom of the Biblical books, which in reproducing the statements of others or in reporting the same events generally do so in different ways. In Acts 15, vss. 20 and 29 are two accounts of the letter sent by the Jerusalem congregation to the Christians at Antioch, yet the order is different, and the general term "idolatry" in the first instance is made clearer by the more specific "things sacrificed to idols" in the latter. In the several hundred quotations found in the New Testament from the Old Testament there is perhaps not one of as many as half a dozen words that in form (though always in substance) is an exact reproduction of the original. Perhaps the Pauline quotation (Rom. 1, 17, taken from Hab. 2, 4*b*) is as near an exception as can be found, but here too the New Testament says "his" faith, while the Septuagint incorrectly translates "my" faith—one example of a number of others where the New Testament corrects on the basis of the Hebrew original an

error of the Septuagint. A comparison of the doings and sayings of Christ, as reported in the Synoptic gospels, reveals the fact that only in exceptional cases is there a verbatim agreement. Christ taught the Lord's Prayer twice (Matt. 6, 9-13 and Luke 11, 2-4), yet these differ not only in this that according to the best text the latter omits the Introduction, except the Address, as also the Third and the Seventh Petition, but also words the Fourth and the Fifth Petition differently, the most noteworthy instance of which is that in the former case we pray to have our trespasses forgiven "as" (ὡς) we forgive our trespassers, while in the second case it is "because" (γάρ). A characteristic illustration of this is found in the fact that all the four gospels give different versions of the superscription on the cross (cf. Matt. 27, 37*b*; Mark 15, 26*b*; Luke 23, 38*b*; John 19, 19*b*). The duplicates in the Scriptures do not at all agree verbally, as can be seen from a comparison of II Sam. 22, and Ps. 18, or of Is. chap. 37-39 with Kings chaps. 19-20 and II Chron. 32. Paul narrates the story of his conversion several times, once to the Jews in Jerusalem (Acts 22, 3 sqq.), and in Acts 26, 9 sqq., yet with marked difference in details. Indeed the sacred writers seem to be perfectly indifferent to exact form of expressing their thoughts.

There is at least one verse where it would seem that only one factor was active, namely, the human. This is Rom. 16, 22, where the scribe of this letter, Tertius, injects a statement of his own. We know that Baruch did the writing for the Prophet Jeremiah (cf. Jer. 36, 4, 17, 18, 27, 32; 45, 1), but there are no evidences that he added anything of his own. Who the "we" are that attest the correctness of the Fourth

Gospel (John 21, 24*b* — which chapter is a later appendix and doubtlessly by the author himself, who had completed the gospel proper with the 20th chapter), is not known but they are often regarded to be the elders of the congregation in Ephesus at whose request it is said this book was written.

The fundamental truth that the message which the Biblical writers bring is from God and that what they speak and write is God's Word, is so overwhelmingly attested in their writings that it almost seems a work of supererogation to refer to the scores of passages that prove this. Thus in the case of nearly every important prophecy the introductory words given in different ways state that the message came from God. A rather noteworthy indication of this is the fact that in many cases the prophets actually mention the date of their prophecy, e. g., Is. 6, 1 (the inaugural vision of this prophet); 36, 1; 38, 1; 39, 1; Jer. 21, 1; 25, 1; 27, 1; 32, 1; Ezek. 1, 1; 8, 1; Dan. 1, 1; 2, 1; 6, 1; 7, 1; 8, 1; 9, 1; 10, 1; 11, 1; Hag. 1, 1; 2, 1; 2, 10; 2, 20; Zech. 1, 1; 7, 1; Amos 1, 1 and often.

How entirely sure the Apostles were that the source of their announcements and authority was divine revelation, is particularly clear from that intricate 7th chapter of I Corinthians. Here Paul answers a question put to him by the congregation in a letter (vs. 1), namely, on the advisability of marriage under existing circumstances. In the course of his reply he distinguishes several times between what he says by inspiration and divine authority and the advice which he gives only as a pastor. In vs. 10 he is not personally giving a command to the married, but this is from the Lord (cf. Matt. 5, 32 sqq.). In vs. 20 he distinctly says that

it is not a divine command but a personal advice he is giving in this case; and the same thing is stated in vs. 25 in reference to the virgins, and in general the same principle is expressed in vs. 40. In vs. 6 it is particularly presupposed that he has no divine command on the point discussed but he regards what he says as a concession.

It is clear from this and from other facts and statements in the Scriptures that the Spirit who guided the Apostles and the prophets to speak with divine authority in what they said and wrote, was not a permanent possession and ready for their use on any occasion. In II Kings 4, 27 the prophet Elisha declares that the Lord had at that time not revealed to him the answer desired. Luther, on Gen. 44, cites this passage as confirmatory of the old dictum of the theologians, *"Spiritus Sanctus non tangit semper corda prophetarum."* But these facts teach also the other important truth that this inspiration of the sacred writers came not from writers as an expression of a natural religious genius, but from without and whenever so willed by God. This explains why even unwilling agents were sometimes employed by God for the revelation of His will, as in the case of Balaam (Num. 23, 8, 12, 20); or Saul (I Sam. 10, 6, 10; 19, 20-21), or Caiaphas (John 11, 49-51). It was after the Pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Ghost that Peter still needed a divine vision in Joppa and his experience with Cornelius to convince him that the Gentiles too were entitled to membership in the Kingdom of God (cf. Acts 10, 1 sqq.; 11, 1 sqq.) and that he was guilty of hypocrisy in Antioch, for which he was publicly rebuked by Paul (Gal. 2, 11-14). Jonah, evidently a prophet of

good repute (II Kings 14, 25), is guilty of the grossest disobedience and shows a mean disposition in connection with his mission to Nineveh (Jonah 1, 3 sqq.; 4, 1 sqq.); Elijah, the typical prophet of the Old Testament, was guilty of despair (I Kings 19, 4); as Moses was of unbelief (Num. 20, 10); John the Baptist, of doubt in Christ (Matt. 11, 3; Luke 7, 19); Jeremiah and Job (Jer. 20, 14-15; Job. 3, 1-4) curse the days of their birth. Paul repeatedly declares that he received directly from God in visions even some facts which he could possibly have received through ordinary channels of information, e. g., I Cor. 15, 3 (second clause), and the subject matter in II Cor. 12, 2-4 (he is here speaking of himself, cf. vs. 5-7); Acts 22, 17. This fact, as well as the independence of his apostolic authority, which he insists he had received directly from Christ, is the chief object of discussion in Gal. 1 and 2. John as the author of Revelation repeatedly declares that he received his message through inspiration, but the opening verse (1, 1) alone covers the contents of the whole book, the unity of which is apparent from the conclusion (22, 18-19).

The inspiration of the Old Testament can be more readily proved by external argumentation than can that of the New, for the latter in different ways quotes the former scores of times and always with the understanding that this reference decides the case, because the entire Old Testament is the authoritative word of divine revelation; thus with one form of introduction in Matt. 2, 5, 23; 8, 17; 12, 17; 13, 35; 24, 15; 27, 9; Luke 18, 31; Acts 2, 16; with another form in Matt. 1, 22; 2, 15; another in Luke 1, 70; Acts 4, 25; 2, 30-31; 3, 18, 21; Heb. 4, 7; Rom. 9, 25; 16, 26; another in

Acts 1, 16; 28, 25; another in Rom. 4, 25; 28, 25; another in Rom. 4, 3; 9, 17; 4, 17; 15, 9; John 9, 24; James 2, 23; II Cor. 4, 28; 8, 15; 9, 9; I Cor. 9, 9; Gal. 3, 8; 4, 27, 30, and other passages.

In these cases it is particularly instructive to note that there is no difference made in the authoritative character of these citations and it does not matter whether they refer to purely external matters, such as history or chronology, or to deep principles of revelation. The mere *ipse dixit* of the Old Testament settles the matter; the γέγραπται is sufficient, even in the case where an important argument hinges on the fact that in the original the singular and not the plural form of a noun is used, as is the case in Gal. 3, 16 (Gen. 22, 18). For the New Testament writers there are no uninspired parts in the Old. The most conclusive general passage in this connection is II Pet. 1, 19-21, and is in general more satisfactory than the passage II Tim. 3, 16, chiefly for this reason that the word translated "inspired" after the manner of the Vulgate, i. e., θεόπνευστος, is a verbal adjective in τος, which form indeed ordinarily has a passive meaning, may yet have an active meaning also as in I Cor. 2, 13 (cf. Cremer, q.v.), and in this case would mean "God inspiring," i. e., objectively, and describe the Word as the means of grace, rather than as the divine source of light and truth. The entire connection shows that it is the author's purpose rather to tell what the Scriptures do than what they are, vss. 15-17, by describing the Christian life that results from their use.

Naturally, there cannot exist such external testimony for the inspiration of the New Testament as the New is for the inspiration of the Old. But the internal

evidences of the New Testament make the same claim for the divine character of their contents that are found in the Old for its inspiration. The Apostles were indeed never commanded to put into written form their message with the exception of the Apocalypse (Apoc. 1, 11, 19; 2, 1, 8, 18; 3, 1, 7, 14; 14, 13; 19, 9; 25, 5), or as in the Old Testament Moses was directed to write certain things (Num. 32, 2, etc.), but they were commanded to preach the inspired truth and to see that its principles were consistently carried out in life, and this was the sum and substance of the final Great Commission given them by the Master in Matt. 28, 19-20; Mark 16, 15-16; and as the Apostles, particularly Paul, repeatedly claim that they are speaking by divine authority, and as their letters have as their chief purpose to supplement the Word that had already by word of mouth been preached and to comment on the latter, as, e. g., II Thess. 2, 5, it is evident that the New Testament written word is equally divine and authoritative with the spoken.

The Scriptures, however, while fully and completely maintaining that the words of Holy Writ, as these came from the pens of the inspired writers (and here is where textual criticism comes in) are the sure hand of God, i. e., teach this as a result and a fact, yet contain no theory as to the particular manner in which the co-operation of the divine and the human factors in the process of inspiration took place, only directly and indirectly declaring that the result is the divine truth. The how and the manner, or the philosphy of this inspiration, has not been revealed and is a mystery of faith to be accepted but not to be explained. The Bible does not answer such questions as whether in-

spiration was by dictation, or by adaptation, or any other method of adjustment of the divine to the human, or the human to the divine, but know only that what they bring in their writings is the divine truth, not only in the thought but also in the words. All these are purely speculative questions, interesting indeed but profitless, and can be best answered with a *cui bono?* It is a fine art in theology and Bible work, indeed, to go into the Scriptures as far as we can, but not to try to go farther and to stop where they stop.

But it is not by such methods of logical deduction or Aristotelian syllogisms that we attain to the certainty that the Scriptures are the inspired Word of God. This must be a spiritual and personal conviction and can be secured only through the influence of the Spirit of God that operates through the Word as His means of grace. The deepest convictions of man and of men, those that sway and determine his thought and life, are not the outcome of reasoning processes, but are immediate intuitions and conclusions. This is the case not only in the theological but in other spheres also, such as the aesthetic, or the ethical. The conviction of the inspiration of the Bible, if not gained by the divine character of the truths revealed in the Bible itself, will never be secured. The inspiration of the Bible is just as much an article of faith as is the doctrine of the Trinity and of the Person of Christ, and is accordingly not a matter that can be "proved" or demonstrated or even debated in the correct acceptation of these terms. Discussions on Inspiration, particularly with those who are not believers in the Scriptures, are fruitless except in the interests of Biblical Apologetics and against attacks on the Word.

And accepting such an *a priori* method of certainty on this subject in regard to the entire Scripture and at the same time maintaining that in the examination of an individual difficulty, such as the great chronological *crux* in reference to Cyrenius in Luke 2, 2, and that this same conviction can be reached by a logical and historical process in this individual case, is not arguing in a circle nor begging the question. It is true that the Bible student in this case begins with the conviction of the truth of the Word and ends with this too, but the sources of this conviction are in the cases different, as is also the character of the certainty, the one being spiritual and individual, the other scientific merely. The Fathers of the Church were right when they maintained that the certainty of the divine origin, character and inspiration of the Bible, was the outcome of the *testimonium Spiritus Sancti internum*.

2. The Human Factor. So many data concerning the human factor in the origin, composition and contents of the different books of the Bible have already been given in the two preceding chapters that it is clear that we cannot call the writers merely amanuenses or copying agents of the inspiring Spirit, even if some of the revelations they bring were in their fullest meaning for the development of the Kingdom of God at the time only imperfectly understood by the writers themselves and the immediate readers.

Further marks of the influence of the human factor are particularly apparent in the difference of style noticeable in these books. As far as the mere language is concerned, this is less apparent in the Old Testament than in the New, largely because of the stereotyped character of the Hebrew language, which

shows so few signs of development that the concluding books of this Canon, written a thousand years later than the opening productions, show practically the same type of language as these. More than in the mere language the personalities of some of these writers appear in their rhetoric and vivid imagination, particularly in the brilliant visions of Ezekiel, Daniel, and Zechariah, and in the flights of thought in Job that has caused the book bearing his name to be counted as one of "the world literature." In the poetry of the Old Testament these personal characteristics of the authors are quite apparent, as the contents of these songs grew out of the personal experiences of the writers, as, e. g., the brief glorification of Lamech (Gen. 4, 23-24); the Blessing of Jacob (Gen. 49, 1-33); the Song of Moses (Ex. 15, 1-19); that of Miriam (Ex. 15, 20-21); the "Swan Song" of Moses (Deut. 31, 1-29); the Song of Deborah (Jud. 5, 1-31); the Hymn of Hannah (I Sam. 2, 1-11); the Prayer of Solomon (I Kings 8, 15-61), as also many Psalms of David that grew out of special events in his career, such as Pss. 7, 18, 30, 34 and others; or the Magnificat of Mary (Luke 1, 46-56); the Benedictus of Zacharias (Luke 1, 68-79). The "I" of the Psalter is evidently the person of the author utilizing, under the impulse of the Spirit, his own personal experiences.

In the New Testament it is particularly the Apostle Paul whose personal characteristics, temperament, and experiences play a considerable role in his letters. The defense of his apostolic authority is prominent, e. g., in Galatians, of his personal character in II Corinthians. His natural timidity shows itself clearly in the modest estimate which he put on his oratory, as in I Cor. 2, 1

sqq., possibly in contrast to the eloquence of an Apollos, which caused some of the Corinthians to prefer the latter (I Cor. 1, 12; 3, 4); or in his concern as to the effect of his first letter on the Corinthians, that induced Paul to send Titus to Corinth to see about the matter, and when the latter failed to report to the Apostle at Troas, so agitated the latter that he had to put an end to his work in that city as reported vividly in II Cor. 2, 13. In perfect harmony with men of this type we find on the other hand a boldness that induces him to ask in I Cor. 4, 21, whether he shall come to them with a rod, and in I Cor. 4, 7-15 to pour out a vial of bitter irony and scorn on the Corinthians (as did Elijah on the priests of Baal, I Kings 18, 27, 28) because of their spiritual conceit; it is only a man of the temperament of Paul who can on the one hand call himself the chief of sinners and on the other glory in having labored more than all the others. In other Biblical books the personalities and personal experiences of the writers or persons described are prominent factors, notably in the last four books of the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel and others. In a certain sense we can also speak of a Pauline, a Petrine and a Johannine type of Christian teachings represented in the New Testament books, not in the antagonistic sense of the Tübingen school but rather in this that they represent from different angles and viewpoints the one truth of the Scriptures, and for this reason Paul is frequently called the Apostle of Faith, John, the Apostle of Love, Peter, the Apostle of Hope, because of the predominating trend of their teachings.

When God did inspire certain men to act as His agents for communicating to the world His Word, He

evidently did not change the temperament and natural mental tendencies of these men (however radically He did change their hearts) but sanctified these natural gifts to His specific purposes. David doubtlessly was by nature gifted as a poet, but God guided him to become the sweet psalm singer of Israel. Paul was by temperament as a Pharisee, when he was "snorting" for the blood of the Christians (Acts 9, 1), what he was when later he rebuked a Peter in Antioch (Gal. 2, 11 sqq.), or contended with Barnabas about John Mark (Acts 15, 39), but in an altogether different spirit.

However it would be imprudent to see in the personalities and natural temperament of the writers the chief reason for the peculiar features of the revelations given in the various books of the Bible. Thus there was nothing in the past of Paul that naturally made him a missionary to the Gentiles; he was "called" to this work (Acts 9, 15; 23, 11; 27, 24; Rom. 1, 5; 15, 18; Gal. 2, 7, 9). His Pharisaic antecedents were but a poor preparation for such a mission; and the man, who as a Roman citizen (Acts 25, 10, 21 and elsewhere) — was really a member of the aristocracy, was not naturally inclined to become the protagonist of a democratic Christianity that embraced the whole Gentile world.

But with these and similar evidences of the presence and influence of the human factor in the genesis of the Biblical books two important facts are directly and indirectly evident, namely, 1) That the controlling factor was the divine, and that nowhere the human factor appears as having in any way prevented the divine from revealing the truth and *only* the truth; 2) That the Scriptures nowhere in any way restrict

or limit the influence of the inspiring Spirit to certain parts or portions of the Scriptures, no matter whether the subject matter be eternal and divine mysteries, or deal with ordinary facts of nature, or man — all alike in the Bible as it stands are the divine truth. The Bible teaches, not that it *contains* the Word of God (with a possible admixture of error), but that it is the Word of God.

PART II

THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF HERMENEUTICS

(135)

How do we know we have written

CHAPTER I

The Sense of the Author

1. Interpretation as Reproduction. The first and foremost principle in the interpretation of the Scriptures, which obtains equally in secular literature, is that it is the interpreter's business to reproduce with perfect exactness and correctness the sense of the author, that is, the thoughts which the author of a passage or passages had in mind when this passage or these passages were penned. Thus, e. g., the passage in Rom. 1, 17 "The just shall live by faith" is only then correctly understood when the thought, which was in the author's mind and heart, has, through the words in which this thought has been clothed, been correctly reproduced and photographed in the mind and heart of the reader or student. This original thought of the author is the sense of the passage which is being interpreted. The moment the interpreter finds more in a passage than the author has put into it, or finds something different from this, he is engaging, not in exegesis, but in eisegesis, not in interpretation, but in misinterpretation. The work of an interpreter is thus very modest and humble; it is confined to reproduction and does not permit the production of new thought. In this most important sense the exegete does not attempt originality, although naturally this does not imply that he cannot expand and expound the thoughts of the originals by materials drawn from sources out-

side of the text (although in this case as far as interpretation is concerned such extra-textual material is to contribute only to the clearer reproduction of the thought contained in the text and not to add to it), or apply the principles found in the text to conditions other than those presupposed by the author when he penned his words; for however much the precise application, e. g., of an ethical principle made by a Biblical writer may be conditioned by historical surroundings and these latter may have been entirely changed, the principles themselves are eternal and for all times, also under altogether different historical conditions. But such application of Biblical teachings to modern conditions really goes beyond interpretation in the technical sense of the term and hence beyond exegesis proper.

Sometimes this reproduction can be brought about by a correct translation alone. This is the case, as far as the Scriptures are concerned, in all those statements dealing with purely external matter, such as historical, chronological, geographical, and kindred matters, which naturally fall within the functions and sphere of the human mind to grasp and to comprehend. Thus when in Gen. 12, 1 sqq. the call of Abraham is reported, or in Ex. 3, 1 sqq. the call of Moses, these historical facts can be apprehended by the mind of man, also by an unbeliever, as in all cases where — to use an expression of our old Hermeneutical writers — the *sensus literae* (not the *sensus literalis,* which is the sense conveyed by the words also in dealing with the deepest of revealed truth, over against the *sensus mysticus,* where the sense is conveyed not by words, but by things in words, as in Parables or Types) is transparent also to the unregenerated mind.

But the heart and kernel of the Scriptures does not consist of such externals, but of the mysteries of faith, such as the Trinity, the Person and Work of Christ, the Plan of Salvation, Justification, Sanctification, Faith, and kindred fundamentals, and to grasp these is beyond the power of the natural mind, but can be apprehended in their spiritual purposes only by those who have experienced and felt these truths as a part of their inner life. They must be spiritually discerned according to the express teachings of I Cor. 2, 13, 14 (I Cor. 1, 23; John 8, 47; 18,37); as these are heart truths and not merely, or chiefly, head truths. A scholar to be an interpreter of the greatest truths of the Scriptures must himself be a Christian and can apprehend these truths only in so far as he has felt and experienced them, however unsuccessfully even then he may be able to form intellectual concepts of them, or define them dogmatically and logically. Theology is properly called a *habitus practicus*. It is for this reason too usually love's labor lost to argue with non-Christians on the spiritual truths of Christianity, because there is no common ground between the two upon which to found an agreement. It is true that in such a passage as John 1, 1, "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God, and the Word was God," also an unregenerated man can form a hazy and even for him a definite conception of what these words according to the ordinary laws of language would mean, but only Christian experience can teach the interpreter the real deeper meaning of this passage. The same is true when, in John 3, 16, it is stated that God gave His only Begotten Son (really perhaps better "only existing" Son, according to the use of the word μονογενής in Luke 7,

12; 8, 42; Heb. 11, 17); all of which words have a certain meaning for the natural mind but not the full or even chief meaning deposited in the text. The words "God," "loved," "world" all mean something for the non-Christian, but the latter is not capable of grasping the full, or even characteristic, sense of the passage. Hence among the equipments necessary for the student of the Word in order to reproduce the thought of the Bible writers not only good mental powers, excellent learning and judgment are necessary, but in order to grasp the essentials of revealed truth it is indispensable that the student have the necessary spiritual equipment, such as personal faith, heart-appreciation of these truths, love for this truth, as only in this way can he find his way into that world of thought and feeling in which the sacred writers lived and moved and had their being. If it is true, e. g., that the beauties of poetry can be appreciated only by those who are themselves poetically inclined, it is a hundred times more true, because they pertain to a special sphere, that only those who have personally experienced the truths of revelation can find these when searching the Scriptures. (Cf. Ps. 119, 18; II Cor. 4, 6; 3, 4-6). *"Oratio, meditatio, tentatio faciunt theologum."*

2. The Real Author of the Scriptures. Not the person who did perhaps the manual writing is the author of a literary production, but the person who originated and is responsible for the thoughts contained in such writing. We know that Baruch put the prophecies of Jeremiah into written form (Jer. 36, 4, 32) and that Tertius wrote the Epistle to the Romans (Rom. 16, 22), yet it was Jeremiah and Paul who were the authors of these books and not their amanuenses. We

know from II Pet. 1, 21*b* that the divine and the human factors cooperated in the production of the Biblical books, but not as coordinate and independent factors, since, although it was the holy men of God who did the speaking and the writing, they did so "driven" as a ship before the wind (the probable figure lying in φερόμενοι) by the Holy Ghost. The controlling factor was accordingly the latter and not the former.

It is not always clear just to what extent the thoughts in the minds and hearts of the human authors were identical and fully up to the thoughts of the Spirit who inspired them to write, but this much is clear that this Spirit had at times purposes in mind which His human agents could not at the time they spoke and wrote have fully grasped or appreciated. This is particularly conspicuous in the case of such involuntary and unconscious agents of revelation as was Caiaphas (John 11, 50; 18, 14). But this is so also in the case of the inspired writers especially when predicting the future; indeed it is characteristic of such Biblical prophecy that it cannot, at least in its details, be fully understood until the fulfillment has taken place, hence the extraordinary difficulty for Christians, too, to understand the one prediction book of the New Testament, the Apocalypse, although the general purpose of this book is clear, namely, the ultimate triumph of the Church of Christ over all its adversaries. Thus when in the Protevangelium (Gen. 3, 15) the conquest of Satan by the Seed of the Woman is predicted, as also the fact that the former is to bruise the heel of the latter, the author of Genesis could certainly have had but a very meagre conception, if any, of the passion of Christ in which this prediction was fulfilled (Rev. 12, 17). Again when in

Gen. 49, 10 the Messianic scepter is predicted of Judah, even Jacob himself could not possibly have had a full conception of how this was to be realized. The entire Old Testament ceremonial law, as developed throughout the Book of Leviticus, was typical of the redemptive work of Christ (Col. 2, 17; Heb. 8, 5), yet manifestly not in the consciousness of Moses when he penned these ordinances.

In a number of cases it is distinctly seen from the use made in the New Testament of certain passages in the Old that those who wrote this latter and the readers for whom they were written did not fully understand all that the Spirit intended should be conveyed by these passages. Thus in Hos. 11, 1 the simple historical fact is recorded that Jehovah has called His Son out of Egypt, which can refer here primarily only to the Exodus; but in Matt. 2, 15 we are informed that this was a prediction referring to the return of the Christ-child from Egypt. Again in Jer. 31, 15 (cf. Jer. 40, 1) the prophet describes the lamentations of the people of Judah who are being taken into the Babylonian Captivity and halt at Ramah, a short distance north of Jerusalem, and there lament their fate, and the prophecy is really intended to comfort them by the declaration that they are to return (cf. vs. 16, 17). Yet in Matt. 2, 18 it is stated that this lamentation was typically prophetic of the cries of the mothers in Bethlehem at the Slaughter of the Innocents. It is unthinkable that in the minds of Hosea, or of Jeremiah there could at the time, when these sentiments were uttered, have been any conception of their further fulfillment in the early career of the Messiah. Still more remarkable is the statement found in Matt. 2, 23 to the effect that Christ's being brought

to Nazareth was a fulfillment of Old Testament prediction to the effect that He was to be the Nazarene, since there is no single passage in Old Testament that makes such a statement, and the passages in the mind of the Evangelist are probably those in which the Messiah is declared to be a "Nezer," or branch or root (Is. 11, 1, 10; cf. Is. 53, 2; Zech. 6, 12; Rev. 5, 5; Rom. 22, 16; Rev. 22, 16).

In all these and similar cases a deeper and fuller meaning of the Holy Ghost, beyond that which the original writers or readers could possibly have found in these passages when first penned, can be postulated only then when in later revelation this is declared to be the case; to go beyond this may be permissible for homiletical purposes in allegorizing a text, or a fact, i. e., drawing a spiritual meaning from historical data not interpreted in this way in the Scriptures themselves, but it cannot be recognized in Hermeneutics. Sometimes the deeper meaning which a passage has for the later stages in the Kingdom of God have been made known to us, while that which it had for contemporaries of the prophet is hidden. A notable instance of this is the Immanuel passage in Is. 7, 14 (Is. 8, 8; 9, 6), which according to Matt. 1, 23 is a prediction of the birth of the Messiah from a virgin. Just what specific significance it had for the times of Isaiah is not altogether clear, although it is clear that it refers to an event emblematic of the speedy deliverance of Ahaz and the people of Jerusalem when endangered by Israel and Samaria. Could Moses, when he penned the brief account concerning Melchizedek in Gen. 14, 18-20, possibly have had in mind the importance of this rule for later developments in the Kingdom of God as indicated

by Ps. 110, 4; Heb. 5, 6; 6, 20; 7, 17, including such mysterious details as Heb. 7, 3-10?

The allegory — if so it can be called — of Paul in Gal. 4, 21-31, which makes Hagar and Sarah illustrate two convenants, is an unique example of how the Spirit did put into certain Old Testament passages and facts a meaning not present in the mind of the writer who penned these words. It is not an example of this popular allegorizing of the Old Testament, as practiced particularly by Philo, but probably an *argumentum ad hominem,* the participle ἀλληγορούμενα being taken conditionally. Such an argumentation is not reprehensible if used to uphold a proposition in itself correct.

The real author of the Scriptures is the Holy Spirit and He it is who determines what the full sense of a passage is, no matter how, or to what a limited extent this full sense may have been present to the writers. It is this common authorship of the Two Testaments by the one Spirit that also fully justified the interpretation of the Old in the light of the New. *"Vetus Testamentum in Novo patet."* But nothing justifies a human scholar in going beyond the historico-grammatical sense of a passage unless the Spirit has shown this to be correct; and hence too there is no justification for the fourfold sense claimed by the Roman Catholic church to exist in the Scriptures, namely, a literal, an allegorical, tropological and an anagogical, and who accordingly interpret, e. g., Ex. 20, 8, in the literal sense as actual physical rest; in the allegorical, as rest in Christ; in the tropological, as the rest of the soul; and in the anagogical, as rest in heaven; or, who after the manner of Philo, interpret the four rivers in Eden (Gen. 2, 10-14) to signify the four cardinal virtues of prudence, temper-

ance, courage, and justice. All such methods are entirely arbitrary and not justified by a single fact in the Word.

That the human factor, on the other hand, should have had in mind other thoughts than the divine, or even thoughts inconsistent with the divine — of this there are no evidences, direct or indirect, in the Scriptures, which declare that "all" Scriptures are inspired. Remembering the origin and purpose of the Scriptures, there is nothing unworthy of the Spirit, even in such passing details as the inquiry of the author concerning the health of Gaius, in III John 2, or when in II Tim. 4, 13 Paul directs his pupil to bring with him to Rome his cloak, books, and parchments from Troas; or when in I Tim. 5, 23 Paul gives him medical advice for his dyspepsia, as also in countless minor particulars especially in the historical books of both the Old and the New Testament.

3. The Clearness of the Scriptures. The Bible, like any other literary production, if it is to be understood by its readers, must be characterized by clearness, both in the thoughts it brings as also in the manner in which these are expressed. That the Bible was intended by its authors to be understood is evident from numerous passages, such as Ps. 119, 105, 130; Prov. 6, 23; II Pet. 1, 19; II Tim. 3, 15-16; and this characteristic of the Word, oral or written, is made the basis of arguments, e. g., Mark 16, 16; John 3, 16; I Tim. 1, 15; Gen. 15, 6 (18, 18); 49, 10. Even if this comment given in John 5, 39 (Luke 24, 27) is addressed to the Jewish leaders and not to the people in general, since in the Fourth Gospel the term "Jews" is originally used in this

restricted sense, yet taking it with other proofs, as that of the Bereans recorded with approval (Acts 17, 11*b*), it shows that the Word is considered as intelligible also to the common Christian. The clearness of the Bible is absolute in itself, but for us this clearness is only relative. This means that the facts and also the expression of these facts in the Scriptures are in themselves clear, but because of hindrances in ourselves, such as prejudice, ignorance, inability to reconstruct the original surrounding of the passage, we are often not capable of fully penetrating everywhere its meaning.

As the central truths of the Scriptures, the revelation of the plan of salvation, including the attributes of God, the personality of the Redeemer, the doctrines of faith and grace, are all transcendental and are mysteries, i. e., beyond the power of human reason to understand or to form mental concepts of, it is only natural that of these we "know only in part," according to I Cor. 13, 12 (II Cor. 5, 7). No person can grasp intellectually and fully the meaning of such a passage as John 3, 16, although as a spiritual truth its blessing can be enjoyed through faith even if the Christian's intellect fails to grasp it. The main element in faith is the *fiducia,* although naturally the *notitia* can not be entirely absent; but the latter is not the measure of the former. The full knowledge of these divine mysteries has been reserved for the hereafter (I Cor. 13, 12; 2, 9; Is. 64, 4).

The chief source of exegetical *cruces,* although not the only one, lies in the difficulty we have in the reconstruction of the original surroundings of a text. Generally when this has been done the difficulty yields readily, providing the trouble is not of a psychological character and is to be found in an unwillingness on the

part of the student to deal fairly with the Scriptures. It is this latter attitude toward the Bible that is largely responsible for most of the so-called "contradictions" which radical scholars are so apt to find in these books. Thus when Kuenen declares it as his "standpoint" that the Old Testament religion is one of the greatest religions of the world, nothing less "but also nothing more," he from the outset denies all inspiration to the Scripture and begs the question at issue.

A brief examination of a number of such difficulties will readily show that correctly understood these will disappear. One of these difficulties often urged is that the Pauline elaboration of doctrine, particularly his doctrine of the atonement through the blood of Christ, is declared to be an addition to the teachings of Christ, and that this doctrine is not found in the gospels nor was taught by Christ, so that in reality Paul and not Christ would be the author of orthodox teachings on this fundamental doctrine. It is true that the gospels do not report *in extenso* — not even in John's Gospel — a theology of Christ on this subject, but this does not mean that Christ did not fully instruct His disciples on this and kindred subjects, even if all this is not recorded in our gospels. It must be remembered that these gospels were written decades after the Gospel had been preached and that the story of Christ's sufferings and death are in these books recorded as historical facts for readers who long since by the preached word had been taught the soteriological significance of these facts. They knew the theological meaning of these facts long before these latter were permanently recorded for them by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. It is a phenomenal abuse of the *argumentum ex silentio* to conclude that

the failure to elaborate the doctrine of atonement by writers of historical books justifies the claim that these men did not know of this doctrine. The epistles of the New Testament, taken as a group, are older than the gospels as a group and the contents of the former are chiefly comments on gospel facts as handed down traditionally and before put into literary form. To get a full and fair picture of early Christianity and its teachings, the epistles and the gospels must be taken together.

Besides there are found in the gospels ample evidences of the fact that the atonement through the death of Christ was a part of the teachings of these books. This is already indicated externally by the topheavy character of these books, i. e., by the fact that fully one-third of these records is devoted to the story of the passion and death of Christ, showing the relative importance of these events in the minds of the gospel writers. Already in the private conversation with Nicodemus, in the second year of His ministry (John 3, 14-15), Christ had announced this fact; and in Matt. 20, 28 (Mark 10, 45) He shows the significance of this death and uses the Pauline technical term λύτρον (cf. Luke 1, 68; 2, 38), after having repeatedly announced His approaching death and resurrection in the Synoptics as also in His final discourse to His disciples beginning with John chap. 13; and when in connection with these declarations it is repeatedly said that the disciples did not understand this, e. g., Mark 9, 32; Luke 9, 45; 18, 34, this does not refer to the thought as such but to the signficance of His death for the Messianic Kingdom He was about to establish.

Christ more than once told His disciples that which they either did not understand at the time, or were not

expected to understand, until they had been led into all the truth by the promised Paraclete. This was the case with regard to the temple of His body (John 2, 19-22; Matt. 26, 61; 27, 40). When at the Transfiguration He had given to His three favorite disciples (favorites, probably not for personal reasons but because they understood Him and His mission better than the others), a preliminary view of the heavenly glory that awaited Him (Matt. 17, 1-13; Mark 9, 2-13; Luke 9, 28-36), He particularly enjoins on them (Matt. 17, 9) that they should tell no man what they had seen until after the resurrection (cf. Mark 9, 9-10). Thus too, when washing the feet of His disciples, He tells them that they will be able to understand His act not now but later (John 13, 7). One of the functions of the promised Comforter in John 14, 26 is to recall to mind for the Apostles all the things that Christ had told them, which naturally does not mean merely assist their memory, but to enable them to understand fully what they had originally failed to grasp (cf. John 14, 16; 15, 26). Doubtlessly the deeper significance of the death of Christ, which the disciples according to the gospels had not been able to comprehend, belonged to these truths that they were to understand better afterwards; for that they did learn to understand them is amply attested by the contents of Acts and of the Epistles.

The reconciliation of the teachings of Paul and of James on the question of justification by faith or by works has been for centuries a chronic *crux,* and in some circles is even now regarded as incapable of solution. Paul (e. g., Rom. 3, 24; Eph. 2, 8) expressly teaches that we are justified by faith and not by works, while James (2, 24) seemingly just as explicitly says

that we are justified by works as well as by faith. But, as is seen from the context in James, this writer only insists that a formalistic, dead, and historical faith, such as even the devils may have (vs. 19), cannot justify, but only that faith can which is a vital and spiritual power, and as such produces good works. It is in this latter sense that Paul uses the word "faith" and in this sense alone, and hence they agree on the thing itself. They use also the word "works" in different senses. Paul denies that works are a root of faith; James insists that works are the fruit of faith. Both are right and teach the same thing.

The difficulties in the Scriptures, that seem to militate against their clearness, may be found in various external spheres. Thus the reference in Luke 2, 2 to Cyrenius being governor of Syria at the time when Christ was born is of a chronological nature, since the historian Josephus (Antiqq. XVII, 53; XVIII, 1, 1-2) speaks of him as having been ruler some ten years after the death of Herod the Great, who was still alive when Christ was born, probably 4 B. C. But the Annals of Tacitus and Strabo make statements to this effect that Cyrenius was twice ruler in Syria—a conclusion accepted by Mommsen and other critical historians, and the statement of Luke evidently refers to this earlier rulership. Besides it is unthinkable that Luke, who (1, 1-4) expressly declares that it was his purpose to write an "accurate" gospel, should have made such a serious blunder about a well known historical fact at the very outset of his book.

Akin to this difficulty is that presented by the genealogies of Christ in Matt. 1, 1-17 and Luke 3, 23-28, especially because from David down to Christ prac-

tically entirely different sets of names are given. Evidently Matthew aims to give the descent of Joseph, legally the foster father of Jesus, as he is writing for Jewish readers and he traces this lineage back only to Abraham, the common ancestor of the Jews; while Luke wants to give the descent of Mary, the real earthly parent of Jesus, as he himself had already reported in chapter 2; and writing to prove the universality of the redemption through Christ, he traces His ancestors back to Adam, the common father of all mankind. Luke in saying that Eli was the father of Joseph (while Matthew says it was Jacob) evidently means father-in-law, and the real father of Mary, as the expression of descent in Luke in the τοῦ is used in a looser relationship, as Adam too is made a descendant from God. Both Joseph and Mary were the descendants of David, but through different lines, one through Solomon, and the other through Nathan, both sons of David (cf. Matt. 1, 6; Luke 3, 31).

Again when in Matt. 27, 44 and Mark 15, 32 it is stated that the two malefactors on the cross also reviled Christ, while Luke 23, 39 reports that one accepted Him as the Messiah, the first must evidently refer to the first hours on the cross and the second to the close of these six hours, when one had repented.

Again in Matt. 8, 5-13 we are told that the Centurion himself came to Christ, while in Luke 7, 1-10 it is stated that Jewish friends interceded for him. Objectively the latter must be the more accurate account, but what he did through others he really did himself. In these and similar cases that account must be regarded as objectively in acordance with the facts in the case in the light of which we can explain the other account.

The express statement of Christ (Matt. 12, 40) that He would be in the heart of the earth three days and three nights, although He really was there only two nights, one whole day and part of two others, finds its explanation in the *usus loquendi* of the Jews. Comparing I Sam. 30, 12 and 13 shows what the Jews ordinarily meant by "three days," not necessarily three entire days and nights that make up the νυχθήμερον of the Greeks. Besides the Lord is here quoting Jonah 2, 1 (1, 17). Compare John 20, 26 where eight days is put for one week, and Mark 9, 2 "after six days," with Luke 9, 28 "about eight days."

From time to time some of these difficulties find their solution in the discovery of new historical facts. Thus in Gen. 37, 3 (cf. vss. 23 and 32) it is recorded that the giving of a coat "of many colors" to Joseph was the cause of hostility on the part of his brethren, this word found only here and in II Sam. 13, 18-19 being a translation of the Septuagint ποικίλος. What the second passage had suggested has now been shown to be true by the discovery of the same word in the Babylonian, where it means a "coat with long sleeves," such as the royalty wore. Now we understand the actions of Joseph's brothers and the question in Gen. 37, 8.

Only recently have we learned how it came that the Roman soldiers (not the Jews—Matt. 27, 27 sqq., Mark 15, 16; John 19, 2) in derision placed a crown of thorns on the Lord's head and saluted Him as King. A recent literary find in Egypt contains two letters of the Jews of Alexandria to the authorities in Rome complaining that the soldiers were making a mockery of the Messianic hopes of the Israelites in their entertainments on

the stage of their barracks. In mocking the Jewish king Jesus, the soldiers were evidently enjoying an old sport.

It is not yet sure if the discovery of several dozen civil laws like those in the Pentateuch found on the column of Hammurabi antedating the times of Moses by four hundred and more years, justifies the conclusions that certain groups of Mosaic laws were the old Semitic customs modified by the spirit of mercy, as the laws in the Pentateuch certainly are when compared with the Draconian Decrees of Hammurabi. The distinctions, e. g., between clean and unclean animals is centuries older than the Pentateuch (cf. Gen. 7, 2; 8, 20 —Lev. 11, 1 sqq.); and circumcision is older than when a religious significance was assigned to it in the case of Abraham (Gen. 17, 10—Lev. 12, 3).

This does not mean that even all Biblical external difficulties have been solved, but it does show that the greater the light becomes that illumines the historical background of the Bible the clearer the latter becomes. Pick and spade in recent archaeological research in Bible lands have been valuable exegetical aids. The more light that is thrown on the Scriptures, the greater becomes their glory. No other work of literature can afford to challenge the most powerful test of criticism as can the Word of God; everytime it is submitted to such a test the gold of divine truth comes out in more perfect purity.

CHAPTER II

The Original Languages

1. Languages of the Bible. In the exact interpretation of any literary production, sacred or secular, the original language in which it was written is the final court of appeal. This does not mean that Biblical thoughts cannot be gained through a translation also, or that the average Bible reader or student must necessarily be master of the original tongues in which it was written; but it does mean this, that for scientific and exact interpretation at least a working mastery of these languages is necessary; as also this that he who has not acquired this mastery is dependent entirely upon secondary sources for his knowledge of what the Scriptures teach, as only the original is the primary source. To gain such a mastery, if at all possible, is accordingly even a moral duty for the conscientious and thorough Bible student.

Three languages are employed in the composition of the Bible, viz., 1) The Hebrew, or the language of Canaan, in the great bulk of the Old Testament; 2) Aramaic, also a dialect of the Semitic group and akin to the Hebrew, in Dan. 2, 4 to 7, 28; Ezra 4, 8 to 6, 18; 17, 12-26; Jer. 10, 11 and in individual expressions found occasionally in the Hebrew text, e. g., Gen. 31, 47 and in Aramaic forms, e. g., in Koheleth, as there are Greek musical terms in Daniel 3, 5, 7, 10; 3) The Greek for the entire New Testament, the common liter-

ary idiom of the New Testament period (ἡ κοινὴ διάλεκτος) also found in hundreds of contemporary papyri documents in Egypt, but with an admixture of Hebraisms found only in the New Testament literature, and here practically in all the books but in different degrees in the various writings, varying from the almost un-Greek of the Apocalypse to the almost classical of James and Hebrews. This latter element in New Testament Greek must not be underestimated, as is a tendency at present just as it was a tendency in former decades to overestimate it. Much of what we have in the gospels (indeed one entire gospel, namely Matthew) is really a translation from Aramaic originals. This is the language that Christ used, for instance, in the Sermon on the Mount, in the Parables, etc., so that what we have in the New Testament in this regard is really a translation and it is only natural that a good retranslation of the New Testament back into Hebrew is often a great help to the student. The trial of Christ and His conversations with Pilate were doubtlessly carried on through an interpreter, as the Procurator certainly did not understand the current Aramaic of the land, and there are not the slightest indications that Christ ever employed any but this Aramaic dialect. That Christ Himself used the Aramaic and not the Old Testament Hebrew, or much less the Greek, is clear from the wording of quotations found in the Gospels from this language (e. g., Mark 5, 41; Matt. 27, 47). The word Abba (Mark 14, 36; Rom. 8, 15; Gal. 4, 6) is a purely Aramaic form, as the final syllable *a* is the Aramaic article placed after the noun and not before it as is the Hebrew article *ha*. The same is true of the second word in the expression *Ha-kel-dama* (Acts 1, 19). That

there are certain technical terms of Latin origin in the New Testament need not surprise us when it is remembered that Palestine was at that time under Roman sway, e. g., legion (Mark 5, 9, 12; Matt. 26, 53; Luke 8, 30), quadrans (Mark 12, 42), or centurion (Mark 15, 39, 44), or *as* (a coin) (Luke 12, 6; Matt. 10, 29). In other cases these Roman official terms are given in translation. Thus, e. g., Pilate is never called the "Procurator" (Matt. 27, 1), nor is Cyrenius (Luke 2, 2), nor Felix (Acts 22, 24), nor Gallio (Acts 18, 12), nor Paulus Sergius (Acts 13, 7).

2. The Original Languages as Factors in Interpretation. The Bible writers had a unique message to bring, exalted thoughts to convey received through revelation which could not be found in any other literature and for which no language had developed any word meanings. None of the fundamental Biblical ideas, such as the conception of God, of His nature and attributes, of the unique personality of Christ, of all the essential factors in the plan of redemption, such as faith, grace, justification, sanctification, righteousness, and the like, could find expression in the existing languages, for these languages did not have these ideas and hence did not have the words to express these ideas.

One of two things could be done under these circumstances, either to create an entirely new language for the purpose of conveying these unique thoughts, or to take one of the existing languages and to pour into the old words the new gospel message. This latter was done for natural reasons, and hence in the New Testament — which alone can come into consideration at this point — there is a world of words with meanings differing from the meanings of these same words in the

classical Greek. The theology of the New Testament lies chiefly in its technical terminology, and word studies are the best aids to Bible research. New Testament Greek differs immaterially in its forms from the classical; somewhat more in its syntax; most of all and very materially in its word meanings, so that a New Testament dictionary is a much greater necessity to the student than is a New Testament grammar. If a classical writer, such as Xenophon, Plato, or Demosthenes, were to rise from the dead they would not be able to understand the New Testament, almost solely because of its word meanings; for they would be able to do nothing with words like "Word" (John 1, 1); or "faith" in Paul's letters, and countless other unique New Testament conceptions, as these would be enigmas to them.

The method adopted by the New Testament writers to graft upon the Greek words current in their day and date the peculiar meanings and definitions needed to convey their own unique message was through the Old Testament meanings of the corresponding words, especially as found in the Septuagint translation. When the late Biblical scholar Isaac Hall, in response to the inquiry as to the best dictionary for the New Testament Greek, answered that this would be the best dictionary for the Old Testament Hebrew, he gave expression to an important truth for Biblical research; to which can yet be added that the Septuagint, so often called "the Bible of the New Testament writers," is such in a much deeper sense than this that it supplies the forms in which Old Testament citations are usually given in New Testament words. Both the linguistic and the thought peculiarities of the New Testament are naturally and his-

torically most intimately connected with the Old Testament and its famous Greek translation, and not with the classical Greek, or even with contemporary non-Biblical Greek thought or language. The Old Testament was the world of thought in which the New Testament writers lived and moved and had their being, and there are no evidences, not even in such isolated facts as this that the Apostle Paul on three occasions (as in Acts 17, 28, he cites Cleanthus; in Titus 1, 12, Epimenides; in I Cor. 15, 33, Menander) quotes a Greek poet, that contemporary non-Biblical thought influenced the thought or language of the New Testament writers. It is historically not justifiable to claim that if a word, or expression, or even a form of thought could possibly be explained either on the ground of classical Greek, or of Old Testament precedents the former should be preferred; rather is the opposite rule correct. The New Testament literature stands in no outward or inner connection with contemporary and earlier Greek literature, or thought; it is a world of its own. Even Paul, although born in a city of Asia Minor famed in his day as a literary and educational center (cf. Strabo, 14, 673), gives no signs in his writings of having enjoyed a Greek training; he is not skilled in Aristotelian syllogisms or Platonic philosophy, and the methods of argumentation, in harmony with his own statements concerning his education, are rabbinical and distinctively Jewish in form (Acts 22, 13).

One interesting illustration of the Old Testament and Hebrew subconsciousness of New Testament writers is seen in the fact that they not infrequently assign, after the manner of the Semitic type of thought, subjective shades of meaning to words that in the

classical Greek have only objective meanings. The Bible language is a heart and not merely a head language, as is the Indo-European ordinarily, and among them the Greek. The Semitic mind loves to express personal relationship to a thought and not merely to mention the thought objectively; hence not a few New Testament words have heart meanings, where in ordinary Greek there is only an intellectual, or physical idea to be found. Probably the most noteworthy example of this is the fact that the verb γινώσκω, which can indeed after the manner of classical Greek mean merely the intellectual act of knowing (Luke 8, 46; Mark 15, 45; Matt. 12, 33; 21, 45; 24, 32, 33; or with a different shade of meaning Luke 18, 34; John 8, 27), yet generally designates a heart action, being equivalent to loving. Thus in John 2, 24-25; 5, 42; I Cor. 2, 8; especially in I Cor. 1, 21; 2, 11, 12; 8, 2 (where loving is put on a parallel with knowing) to "know" the truth is the same as loving the truth (John 6, 69; 7, 17, 49; 8, 32). Whether the personal attitude of the person who "knows" is favorable to the object, or unfavorable, depends upon circumstances. Thus the Lord knoweth, i. e., loves and favors the way of the righteous (Ps. 1, 6; II Tim. 2, 19; John 10, 14; Matt. 7, 23); but He also knows, i. e., disapproves or condemns the thoughts of His adversaries (e. g., Luke 16, 15*b*). Some of the compounds of this verb show the same peculiarity of the personal relationship of the subject to the object as in προγινώσκω, e. g., Rom. 8, 29, which is knowing *cum affectu et effectu* (with whom God in the beginning entered into this relationship); cf. the parellel in Eph. 1, 4, with a different verb (I Peter 1, 2). The same is true of the verb "see" at times, as I Cor. 9, 1, "seeing

the Lord" means to have entered into personal relationship of apostle to Him, as is evident from the connection. Thus too the expression "eat with," or "lie down at table with" is more than this physical act; it is an expression of close communion and affection (cf. Luke 13, 29; Matt. 8, 11; Luke 14, 15), where it implies membership in the Kingdom of God (also Luke 16, 23).

Then the word *ἀποθνήσκω*, "to die unto," while used also in the physical sense (e. g., Matt. 8, 32; Heb. 9, 27; 11, 13, 21) has in most passages a deeper spiritual and ethical sense (e. g., John 6, 50; 8, 21, 24; Rom. 7, 6, 10; 6, 7; Col. 2, 20; 3, 3).

Other words of the same kind are such as *κενόω*, *οἰκοδομέω*, *διαλογίζομαι* and others. The Old Testament sets the precedent for this, as when the word יָדַע is used in the sense of begetting, or when such an expression as "look upon" the wine when it is red, in Prov. 23, 31, means to learn to love to drink it, and not as the physical act of seeing.

The primary fact that the Hebrew was "the langauge of Canaan" (Is. 19, 18), i. e., the language spoken in Canaan already when Abram emigrated into this country, who naturally had spoken the Aramaic of his native land before this and now acquired the kindred Hebrew when he came there to live (cf. Gen. 31, 47), removes some difficulties with which the Bible student must concern himself in connection with the Pentateuchal problem. One of the standing objections to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is the fact that while this authorship is possible only on the presupposition that these books were completed while Israel was still east of the Jordan, yet the expression "Beyond the Jordan" is repeatedly used (e. g., Gen. 50, 10; Num. 32, 19; Deut.

1, 1; Josh. 13, 27) to designate the East of the river, which would presuppose that the writer had lived west of this stream, i. e., the writing is post-Mosaic. The fact is that this technical geographical term got its meaning from this that the people who originally employed it, i. e., the Canaanites, lived west of the river and that the expression "Beyond the Jordan" meant "East of the Jordan," no matter where the person employing it happened to be.

In the same way the word נֶגֶב may mean the South and the word יָם (sea, i. e., the Mediterranean) may mean West, no matter where the writers using these terms may have been (cf. Num. 34, 6; 35, 5; Ezek. 42, 12; 47, 8; Is. 49, 12; Ps. 107, 3; Josh. 16, 3; 19, 11).

The Hebrew subconsciousness of the New Testament appears not only in the fact that individual words receive specifically Hebrew rather than Greek meanings, as when ῥῆμα, following the Hebrew דָּבָר which means both "word" and "thing," is used also in the sense of "thing" (Luke 2, 15; Acts 10, 37); or in the plural (Luke 1, 65; 2, 19, 51; Acts 5, 32; 13, 42); but also in many expressions, as when "the sons" of the bridechamber are mentioned, i. e., the friends of the bridegroom (Matt. 9, 15; Mark 2, 19; Luke 5, 34); or the "Son of peace" in Luke 10, 6; cf. Matt. 12, 27; Luke 11, 19; Acts 13, 10; Eph. 2, 2; 5, 6; Col. 3, 6 (Ps. 89, 22; I Macc. 2, 47); Mark 3, 17; I Tim. 5, 5; Acts 3, 25; II Thess. 2, 3 (I Sam. 20, 31; II Sam. 12, 5).

An interesting illustration of perhaps unconscious influence of Hebrew thought methods on New Testament writers is the negation of the verb where strictly

speaking the subject should be negated, because in the Hebrew nothing but the verb (not a noun, not an adjective, etc.) can be negated. Thus Rom. 3, 20 reads: "Through the works of the law all flesh shall not be justified," i. e., no flesh shall be justified; or I Cor. 1, 29 "that all flesh shall not boast," i. e., no flesh shall boast. (Cf. Matt. 24, *22b;* Luke 1, 37; Mark 13, 20; Acts 10, 14; Rev. 7, 16; 9, 4; which idiom is often found in the Septuagint, e. g., Ex. 12, 16; 16, 43; 20, 10, etc.).

In a number of cases it is uncertain whether a certain expression has been construed under Greek or under Hebrew influences. This is particularly the case in regard to the article, and it seems a hopeless case to explain with any degree of certainty the presence, or still more the absence of the article in particular passages in the New Testament. Thus in Luke 1, 11 the expression *ἄγγελος κυρίου,* construed according to the Greek would be "an angel" of the Lord, according to the Hebrew and in imitation of the *status constructus,* it would be "the" angel of "the" Lord — both nouns being definite. Thus too the word *κύριος,* in general the equivalent of the Hebrew יהוה , is used without the article, as are all proper names in that tongue, e. g., Luke 1, 32; 2, 11 and again it is after the Greek used with the article, e. g., Luke 1, 47. No doubt constructions like *δούλη κυρίου* (Luke 1, 38) and *χεὶρ κυρίου* (Luke 1, 66) must be regarded as modeled after the *status constructus* and are to be translated "the handmaiden of the Lord, and "the" hand of the Lord (i. e., His power), the last term being regarded as a proper name. On the same principle the expression "Holy Spirit," e. g., Luke 1, 35 is correctly rendered definitely. Sometimes this open question as to the Hebrew or Greek consciousness

may seriously affect the sense, as in the expression υἱὸς θεοῦ (Matt. 27, 54; Mark 15, 39). After the manner of Hebrew thought this would be "the Son of God" and a recognition of His divine nature; after the Greek it would be "a Son of God," and contain merely a recognition of the deity in human form, as when in Acts 14, 11 sqq. the people of Lystra declared Paul to be Mercury, and Barnabas to be Jupiter. According to the parallel passage, viz., Luke 23, 47, the latter meaning alone is to be found in this passage, as Christ is here declared merely to have been "just." The use of the article with the vocative, as in Luke 12, 32; Mark 5, 41; John 19, 3 and frequently found (about sixty times) in the New Testament, can be explained only on the basis of the Hebrew. This explains too the word "Abba" (Mark 14, 36; Gal. 4, 6; Rom. 8, 15), where the last syllable is the Aramaic article and the word is to be rendered "O Father!" as an exclamation. An interesting illustration of Hebrew influence in New Testament syntax is seen in a comparison of Matt. 19, 18-19 with Mark 10, 19 and Luke 18, 20. The second and third gospels here have the regular Greek form for the prohibition, including the negative while Matthew has the strong negative οὐ with the future indicative, surely modeled after the Hebrew as are all the passages in the New Testament where the future is used to express a command, as e. g., Luke 1, 3*b*; 1, 35; Matt. 6, 9; 27, 4 and often.

What is seemingly an unconscious influence of Hebraistic thought in the New Testament is this that in historical narrative the Hebrew order of words rather than the Greek is found, namely, verb, subject, object, after the manner of the *vav consecutivum* construction,

while the Greek order is more apt to be subject, verb, object. Illustration of this can be found in abundance throughout the Synoptic gospels (but not so frequently in John), e. g., Luke 1, 5 to the end of the chapter; in the Parables, Matt. 13, 1 sqq. and often. It is quite possible that the enigmatical construction of the aorist passive participle to express contemporaneous action with the aorist indicative, as e. g., ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν (Luke 1, 18 and frequently), is to be explained as Semitic, since the Hebrew, which rarely uses the participle, would rather say, "And he answered and said" than to say, "Answering he said." There is, too, the abundant use, almost to the point of embarrassment, of pronouns in the New Testament Greek, in marked contrast to the paucity of pronouns in the classical, as also a similar liberality in the use of prepositions in expressing some relationship of words in the New Testament which in the classical are expressed by case endings; further also the mixture of the ἐν and the εἰς constructions, caused probably by the fact that they take the place of a single Hebrew preposition בְּ, which uncertainty of construction can be illustrated by a reference to such passages as Luke 1, 13, 17 and 19, 34, cf. vs. 20 and many others. Occasionally the omission of a preposition would seem to be not without exegetical importance, as in Matt. 7, 22-23, where the dative without a preposition is employed to designate a false use of the name of Christ. It is accordingly more than doubtful if any special conclusions can be drawn from the use of εἰς or ἐν in certain constructions, as "being baptized εἰς" the name of God (Matt. 28, 19; cf. Mark 16, 15-16): or from such expressions as "In Christ" (e. g., Eph. 1, 2 and elsewhere), further than the fact

that Christ was the agent through whom the redemptive plan of God was realized.

The genius of Hebrew thinking on the part of New Testament writers is reflected in many other additional ways. The Hebrew is not given to that exactness in the expression of the relationship of two or more thoughts that belong together to which the Indo-European people are accustomed, but expresses these relationships more loosely. Thus in the Lord's Prayer (Matt. 6, 13; Luke 11, 2) we pray: "Lead us not into temptation," i. e., into a trial or test of our faith, which in this case must be with a view to our harm. The word "temptation" in the New Testament is a *vox media* with the generic meaning of "trial" or "test," as when "tempting God" is mentioned (e. g., Matt. 4, 7; Luke 4, 12), i. e., trying out God to see if His protection would go beyond the limits promised by Him. The meaning of this petition is that God, who indeed may try us and for our good (Ps. 139, 23, 24; Is. 26, 16), is asked so to guide and protect us when we are tempted by other and evil agencies that the result may be for our good. The final outcome is then accordingly in His hands, and He is accordingly here described as the agent who brings about such trials. Luther in his catechism is perfectly right, when, apparently in open contradiction to this petition, he begins his explanation with the words: "God indeed tempts no one;" and his explanation is good exegesis. Thus too when in Amos 3, 6 it is asked whether there is an evil in the city that the Lord doth not do, the prophet ascribes directly to God as the causative agent something over which He exercises only providential control (cf. Micah 1, 12). When Simeon in Luke 2, 34*b* says that the Christ-child is set for the

rise and for the "fall" of many in Israel, this signifies that the coming of Christ shall be the occasion (not the cause) also of many falling away from the truth; something that He in different ways repeats as a fact in Matt. 12, 43-45; Luke 11, 24-26, where He refers to the friendly, at least neutral, attitude of the Jewish hierarchy when He began His ministry, but which has now turned into bitter hostility. The same is true of Matt. 10, 34; Luke 12, 51, where He expressly declares that He had not come to bring peace (cf. Luke 2, 14) but the sword and separation. His coming was actually the occasion for all this—and is yet—but it was not the cause.

Again it is stated in Luke 10, 21, that Christ thanks the Father "because" His message has been hidden from the wise, the meaning being that it is of such a character that the simple-minded can grasp it, but not the wise through their own wisdom (cf. I Cor. 1, 25 sqq.). In Matt. 6, 12 we ask for forgiveness of our transgression "as" (ὡς), i. e., according to the measure of our own forgiveness; but in Luke 11, 4 we ask "because" (γάρ); the thought in both cases is the same.

It is repeatedly stated in Exodus (e. g., 7, 3; 4, 21; 9, 12; 14, 4) that Jehovah hardened the heart of Pharaoh (although it is just as often stated that the king hardened his own heart, Ex. 8, 15, 32; 9, 34) and that He did so intentionally; yet this can mean only that the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, a natural process in all cases where divine grace does not intervene, was not checked by the Lord but allowed to go its own way, so that in reality the Lord's share in this was only passive and negative. This withdrawal of the gracious intervention of the Lord in the case of Pharaoh, is paralleled in the

New Testament in Christ's determination to withhold from all but His disciples the mysteries of the Kingdom of God in His Parables (Matt. 13, 13-16; Mark 4, 12*b*; Luke 8, 10). The passage in Mark, based like the others on Is. 6, 9-10, is particularly strong, especially with its ἵνα (which however in the New Testament often has the softened meaning of ὅτι and even ὅπως). A similar looseness in the expression of the relationship of thoughts is found in the grand panorama of the final judgment as given by Christ (Matt. 25, 31-41); where the "for" would seem to imply that because of their deeds the sheep were accepted and the goats condemned, while in reality the deeds done in the body are not the cause but are the measure of the reward and punishment in the hereafter. As an individual expression of such rather loose construction, attention can be called to the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ of Paul (Rom. 1, 17; 3, 21; 10, 3), which Luther correctly paraphrases "Die Gerechtigkeit, die vor Gott gilt," which is only an adaptation of the subjective (not objective) causal meaning of the verb δικαιόω (to consider or declare just, also found in the classical in contrast to making just), just as the Hiphil of the Hebrew verb is often a subjective causative.

Another form in which this Semitic *quasi* indefiniteness in the expression of thought is found is seen in those passages in which general statements are made without seeming qualifications, which from the context, or because of the analogy of faith, must be limited or restricted by the character of the subject considered. That many of these general statements must be taken absolutely is evident on the same grounds, as when in John 3, 16 it is stated that "all" i. e., without exception, who believe shall be saved; or when in Matt. 11, 28 it

is clear from the general teachings of the Scriptures that literally all without exception who are weary can come to Christ for rest. But in other general statements, such as in the invitation to ask, seek, and find in Matt. 7, 7; Mark 11, 24; Luke 11, 9-13 (Jer. 29, 13, 14), the fact that these words are addressed to believers implies that only those prayers which are in harmony with their relationship to God as believers are here meant. Again when in John 8, 7, in the case of the woman caught in adultery, Christ tells her accusers that he among them who is free from sin shall start to inflict the legally correct punishment of stoning. He does not mean sinlessness on their part, but He does mean free from sin in this particular act of bringing this woman to Him, which they were doing not in the interests of the Law but in order to embarrass Him, as is seen from vs. 6 where their motive is described as "testing" Him out on a matter in which He took a strict unpopular view, i. e., the marriage relation. Again the Lord, in Matt. 26, 28; Mark 14, 23, says that "all" are to drink of this cup, yet according to I Cor. 11, 28 its use is restricted to those who can examine themselves (cf. I Cor. 10, 17). Again when in Matt. 5, 48 Christ tells His disciples to be "perfect," this evidently applies to the matter under consideration only, namely, to the treatment of our enemies (vs. 44) which is to be modeled after God's treatment of His enemies (vs. 45). Thus again in Matt. 18, 18 the authority to loose or to bind is not meant arbitrarily or absolutely, but is meant for the hearers in their capacity as disciples (Matt. 16, 19; John 20, 23). Again John 3, 4 seems to teach absolutely that there is no regeneration except by baptism, but the analogy of Scriptures shows that this

was in the purposes of God only the ordinary way through which regeneration was expected to take place, namely, by the baptism of infants. When in I Cor. 3, 22 it is said "all things are yours," this is not meant absolutely, but relatively, i. e., all things which under the circumstances presupposed could be considered. In Mark 4, 34 it is expressly stated that Christ spoke to His disciples only through parables, but this means that He did so at this time, for afterwards He spoke to them in other ways. For when Paul in I Cor. 8, 13, states he will no longer eat meat, he means only the special meat here mentioned, i. e., the meat sacrificed to idols. The same is true of the general statement of "eating and drinking" (I Cor. 9, 4). All of these and similar seemingly too general statements of the gospels and the epistles can be understood in their sense only when their historical background and connection are taken into consideration, especially the fact that these writings were prepared for those who had long since known of these things through the preached word, and have that meaning which their recipients and the circumstances would find in them. Thus the objection to the reference (cf. John 3, 4) to baptism because Christian baptism as a sacrament had not yet been instituted when Christ had His conversation with Nicodemus can be met with the reply that John's Gospel was written for the third generation of Christians (between 90 and 100 A. D.), when, according to the evidences of the earliest church writers, infant baptism had already been practiced in the church at least for one whole generation, if not for a longer period. When the original recipients of John read this passage they would not possibly think of anything else than of infant bap-

tism, the expression "water and the Holy Ghost," as the grammatical figure of a "hendiadys" meaning the Holy Ghost operating through the water (Ezek. 36, 25; Eph. 5, 26; Tit. 3, 5). That Christ, whose conversation with Nicodemus is here given only in brief extract, just as is even the Sermon on the Mount, and not fully, spoke of Christian baptism to so promising a disciple as Nicodemus even before He instituted it for the Twelve, need not surprise us, as He did the same concerning His death and crucifixion (cf. John 3, 14-15; with Matt. 16, 21; Mark 8, 31). It is a singular fact that while He already speaks to Nicodemus of the soteriological purposes of His death, He does so to the Twelve first in Matt. 16, 21; Mark 8, 31; Luke 9, 22; then for a second time in Matt. 17, 22; Mark 9, 30-32; Luke 9, 43-45; and for a third time in Matt. 20, 17-19; Mark 10, 32-34; Luke 18, 31-34.

This Hebraistic and Old Testament subconsciousness of the New Testament writers appears particularly in the technical terms. Thus the self-appellation of Christ, found in all 78 times in the Synoptic gospels, namely, "the Son of Man," will be misunderstood if its etymology or composition merely is taken into consideration. Nothing can be further from the truth than to find in it a dogmatical statement of the humanity of the Messiah — for how could there have been a question on this matter? The genesis of the term goes back to Dan. 7, 13 (Luke 21, 27), where the "Son of man" is the promised Messiah, who, according to vs. 14, is to have divine dominion and endless sovereignty. When Christ uses this term He identifies Himself with this divine Messiah, promised by Daniel, and His purpose is rather to emphasize His divinity than His humanity. The Biblical and historical term

"Son of Man" practically is identical in meaning with the dogmatical term "Son of God," and is used by Christ often when describing His divine prerogative, as, e. g., the power to forgive sins (Matt. 9, 6; Mark 2, 10; Luke 5, 24), where the claim of the Pharisee that only God can forgive sins is admitted (Mark 2, 7; Luke 5, 21), and upon this concession is based the claim that in forgiving sins Christ is exercising divine prerogatives. The same fact and kind of an argument is resorted to in Matt. 12, 8; Mark 2, 28; Luke 6, 5; and here too the purpose is to prove that the Son of Man is really the Son of God. In these and similar passages the word is a technical term for the Messiah, just as the term "Son of David" was thus understood by the contemporaries of Christ on the Old Testament basis (cf. Matt. 24, 27, 44; 25, 13; 26, 64; Luke 18, 8; 19, 10; John 5, 27; Acts 7, 55; Apoc. 1, 13). The term "Son of Man" was doubtlessly used by Christ in order to emphasize His divinity, a doctrine that He desired above all things to have accepted by His followers, and the acceptance of which by His disciples (Matt. 18, 16; Luke 9, 13) was to Him the source of exceptional joy (Matt. 18, 17-18), and the claim to which led to His condemnation by the Jews (Matt. 26, 63-65; Mark 14, 61-63). Among the Jews the expression "Son of Man" was regarded as an appellation of the Messiah, and it is used in this sense in the pre-Christian apocalyptic Book of Enoch again and again. That the people in appealing to Him chose rather another correct Messianic appellation, i. e., "Son of David," is doubtlessly an expression of their hopes of a carnal and earthly Messianic Kingdom, to be established by the descendant of their ideal and greatest king, David.

The term "Son of Man" found about 90 times in Ezekiel and used by Jehovah in addressing this prophet, has no connection at all with this term in Daniel, although these prophets were in part contemporaries. In Ezekiel it evidently is intended to designate the prophet as a weak mortal over against the powerful Jehovah, who is addressing him. It is interesting in this connection to note that the Hebrew term for man (אִישׁ) comes from a root that signifies "to be weak," and hence the Biblical conception of man as a weakling is quite a contrast to the classic "vir," as a modification of "vis," "power," or strength. Of all the ancient forms of religion the Biblical is the only one that starts out with the conception of sin as a foundation factor — one proof of its revealed character.

Another expression intelligible only from Biblical precedence is "Kingdom of Heaven," or its practically perfect synonym, "Kingdom of God," designating historically what doctrinally and dogmatically is generally termed "the Church." In the Scriptures the terms "heaven" and "God" are virtually identical, as with the former is associated and connoted the ideas of divine power, glory, majesty, and mercy in contrast to weak and sinful man of this earth. Cf. Neh. 2, 20; Ps. 2, 4; 50, 6; 103, 19; 115, 3; 123, 1; Is. 66, 1; Acts 7, 49; 17, 24; Amos 9, 6; Jonah 1, 9; Eph. 4, 10. Luther is accordingly correct, when in explaining the Introduction to the Lord's Prayer (Matt. 6, 9), he states that the words "who art in heaven" are intended to "coax" (locken) us to trust in God to whom we pray. Historically the expression "Kingdom of heaven" is also based on Dan. 7, 13 and signifies the "Kingdom of the Messiah which is to come from heaven," just as the term "King-

dom of God" signifies the Kingdom that comes from or is to be established by God.

Naturally the rich rhetoric and figures of speech found in the Scriptures must be explained, not on the basis of modern, or on Indo-European usages, but from Semitic and Biblical usage. Every language has its own figures, maxims, and the like, that literally are untranslatable, or translated are meaningless. Thus the German may have money "wie Heu," but in the English this is meaningless, the idiom there being "money to burn." Again the English may "be frightened to death," but the expression is meaningless to those speaking another language. For the same reason many of the rich and ornate figures of Ezekiel, Zechariah, Daniel, and the Apocalypse, are almost beyond exact explanation for modern thought. How much, e. g., do we really understand, except perhaps of the general purpose, of a chapter like Ezek. 1?

At times such peculiar Semitic and Hebrew figures yield to an interpretation with the assistance of extra-Biblical Jewish literature, even when the context does not make clear more than their general purpose. Thus the reference made by Christ repeatedly to a faith that will remove mountains (Matt. 17, 20; 21, 21; Luke 17, 6; Mark 9, 23) is simply a hyperbole of speech proverbially used by the Jews to express something that is physically impossible, and this faith really does accomplish, as, e. g., when it secures the forgiveness of sin, eternal life, and the like. The passage I Cor. 13, 2 shows that the application of the truth this proverb contains had become rather indefinite, as a faith of any sort without charity (love) is really unthinkable. Again, speaking of a camel going through the eye of a needle (Matt.

19, 24; Mark 10, 27; Luke 18, 25-27) is by the exegetical statements of Christ Himself shown to mean that it is a figure used to express what is humanly impossible. The fact that these were Jewish proverbial utterances current in New Testament times is clear from the comments on Matt. 19, 20 in Lightfoot's *Horae Talmudicae* and in the supplementary work of Schöttgen with the same title.

What has been stated in reference to the logical features of Biblical thought must be applied also to the rhetorical, especially to the interpretation of figures of speech, which must be understood from the oriental and ancient standpoint, and not from a modern and occidental. Figures are all based more or less on comparison and it is not infrequently difficult to determine how far the *tertium comparationis* goes, or even what this is. Not infrequently ideas and thoughts are connoted in the Scriptures with certain things that differ from those associated with the same in our times. Thus the riding upon an ass — not in consonance with modern ideas of royalty — on the part of Christ when He entered Jerusalem (Matt. 21, 7; Mark 11, 7; Luke 19, 35) signifies that He enters humbly as a prince of peace and not upon horseback as would the commander of an army. His action was a silent protest to the carnal expectations even of His disciples. The same is true of the term "dog" when employed by Christ in the case of the Syrophoenician woman (Matt. 15, 24-26), as an expression for unbelievers. The orientalism behind the expression (Ps. 42, 1) "As a hart panteth for the waterbrook, etc.," gives a vivid idea of the thought, as when the hart, in the dry and hot season, in the evening is accustomed to seek his accustomed drinking *wadi,* and

when perchance he finds that it is without water, in his fearful disappointment, sends up his pitiable cries in a manner that is re-echoed by the hills around. When in Ps. 1, 4 the godless are compared to the chaff which the wind drives away, reference is made here to the exposed threshing floor over which the winds sweep, taking with them the chaff while the heavier grain remains (cf. Matt. 3, 12; Luke 3, 17).

Naturally with the materials thus gained from the same sources, as much as this is possible, from which the originators drew their thought, the same rules that elsewhere prevail in the interpretation of figurative language, must obtain also in the Scriptures. Thus the recognized principle that a word or an expression is to be taken literally unless there are reasons to take them figuratively applies here also. According to this rule the words of the institution of the Lord's Supper (Matt. 26, 26-29; Mark 14, 22-25; Luke 22, 19-20; I Cor. 11, 23-25) are to be taken literally, because there are no Biblical or linguistic reasons to give them a figurative meaning. Besides if they were to be taken figuratively the figures must lie in the subject, or in the object ("This," "body," "blood") but not in the word "is," as this is never used figuratively. When Christ says, "I am the vine" (John 15, 1), or "I am the door" (John 10, 7, 9), the predicates and not the copulative verb are figurative. He really *is* the vine and really *is* the door, but these terms are used figuratively just as in vs. 10 He says that He is a "Shepherd," not literally but figuratively, namely, a spiritual guardian of souls.

On the other hand Christ's demand in John 6, 51-58, that all must eat of His body and drink of His blood, must be taken figuratively and cannot refer to the Lord's

Supper, these words standing for His person through whom alone salvation is declared to be possible. Besides, the eating of His body and the drinking of His blood, in the sense of this pericope, are declared to be absolutely necessary to salvation, which is not the case with the Eucharist. The Analogy of Faith thus too demands the figurative interpretation, as does also the historical fact that the Supper had not yet been instituted: and even had it been, Christ could not have spoken of this deep Christian mystery to unbelieving Jews.

Again the statement (I Cor. 11, 30) to the effect that in consequence of the abuse of the Lord's Supper some had become weak and others had "fallen asleep," i. e., had died (cf. I. Cor. 15, 20), must be referred to physical illness and death, for there are no reasons for a figurative interpretation, especially as in Apostolic times, a critical turning point in the history of the Kingdom of God on earth, unfaithfulness was severely punished as is clear from the cases of Ananias and Sapphira (cf. Acts 5, 1-10).

Again the rather vague Biblical use of the term "thousand" is equivalent to a "large" number but not specifically and exactly a thousand, as can be gleaned from Ex. 20, 6; 34, 7; Jud. 15, 16; I Sam. 18, 7; Job 9, 3; Ps. 90, 4 (II Pet. 3, 8); Ps. 91, 7; Dan. 7, 10, and thus the thousand years in Apoc. 20, 2, during which Satan is to be bound, means only a long but indefinite period of time and probably refers to the centuries of the New Testament church. In its literal phases Chiliasm is an unnecessary problem.

The rule of modern rhetoric that the repetition of words or synonyms practically weakens rather and does not strengthen the thought, does not apply to the

Scriptures, but such repetitions are regarded rather as elements of strength. In fact the repetition of thought is characteristic of one kind of poetical composition in the *parallelismus membrorum* that makes up the poetry of the Psalms (cf., e. g., Ps. 8, 5; 19, 8), a feature that has gone into what are the poetical portions of the New Testament, such as the *Magnificat* of Mary (Luke 1, 46-55); the *Benedictus* of Zacharias (Luke 1, 67-79); or the *Nunc Demittis* of Simeon (Luke 2, 25-35). To find in each and every one of these statements an entirely different thought from what precedes or follows is contrary to the spirit of such a composition. Indeed many of these sentences contain duplicate thoughts, sometimes synonyms, as Luke 1, 47, 71, etc., or antithetical, as Luke 1, 52, 71. This is, however, seemingly not the case in the song of the angels at Behlehem (Luke 2, 14); but would be if the traditional reading of "peace on earth" and "good will towards men" were correct; but the last word is probably εὐδοκίας (genitive) so that it reads "Peace on earth to men of good will," i. e., men ready to receive Christ in faith, as such are referred to in vss. 25 and 38. Such repetitions are found even in that masterful *"multum in parvo,"* the Lord's Prayer (Matt. 6, 9-14 compared with Luke 11, 2-5). In the latter the third and the seventh petitions are omitted in the best Mss. without any material loss, as these two are substantially contained in the second and sixth. Repetitions of synonymous thoughts abound in the teachings of Christ, especially in the Sermon on the Mount. To find, e. g., in each of the Beatitudes, with which this sermon opens (Matt. 5, 3-12), a specifically distinct class of the followers of Christ is not in har-

mony with the genius of the Hebrew mind and is also made impossible by the various predicates, which in several cases are practically identical, e. g., vss. 3, 8 and literally so in vs. 10. When Paul piles up synonymous words as he does in Rom. 1, 29-31 — about two dozen in all — or sentence upon sentence, as he does in Rom. 3, 13-18; or in II Cor. 6, 3-10; or in Gal. 5, 19-22, he does not do so for the purpose of drawing fine distinctions between different words and expressions, but to overwhelm the reader with the full weight of the general thought he meant to convey. Here we probably have to deal with the excitability of Paul's temperament, which appears in not a few passages, as Gal. 1, 6 sqq.; II Cor. 12, 1 sqq. even developing into pronounced and almost bitter irony, as in I Cor. 4, 8-13.

In various ways such emphatic repetitions are found as in the "verily, verily," "for ever and ever, etc.," found in both Testaments. Also in specific statements, as Matt. 10, 41, 42, where one (not two) cases are meant in describing the reward that comes from a prophet or is given by a prophet.

For this reason care should be taken not to make too much out of New Testament synonyms, e. g., from the two verbs ἀγαπάω (used twice) and φιλέω (used once) by the Lord in addressing Peter in John 21, 15-17. In the Scriptures themselves these two words are not infrequently used in exactly the same sense (cf. Cremer); and in the original Aramaic in which this conversation was held, no such a distinction as that between spontaneous and thoughtful love obtains. Thus in Salkinson's Hebrew New Testament both words are translated by אָהַב as is also done by Delitzsch and other translations of this kind.

That the study of New Testament synonyms in many cases is valuable for exact exegesis goes without saying, and is made evident particularly from such works as Trench's "Synonyms of the New Testament," Heine "Synonymik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch," from Cremer, and kindred sources. But the exact distinctions between these words and expressions, and their exegetical value, lie in their differences and not in their agreements, and must be sought for, not in the same words in classical Greek, nor in the etymology — which latter is rarely valuable for the determination of exact meanings, valuable as may be the history of a word and of its meanings — but must be based strictly upon the Biblical *usus loquendi*. In this case too the Scriptures must be self-interpreting.

CHAPTER III

The Context

No rule for the interpretation of the thoughts of another is more self-evident and universally recognized and at the same time more often violated in Biblical exegesis, in which so often passages are torn out of their connection and used and abused for purposes antagonistic to their original purposes, than that one which demands that a thought should be interpreted in connection with the context in which it is originally found. The justification for the rule itself is found in the fact that it is practically impossible to express a thought that does not stand in some connection, stated or implied, with some other thoughts or facts that influence its contents or form or both. And by the context or connection of a word, a passage, or group of passages, often more is meant than that which immediately precedes or follows; it includes all those factors, personal, historical and otherwise, that were active in its production and with which it is interwoven. Thus the Proverbs of Solomon seem at times to be a collection of largely independent statements, a chrestomathy of disconnected ethical injunctions for the guidance of man's conduct; yet back of all these is the Biblical conception of Wisdom, as expressed in Prov. 1, 7, that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and this is the fountainhead of all the mandates expounded in this collection (cf. Prov. 9, 10; Ps. 111, 10; Job 28,

28), and in the light of this fundamental and underlying principle all the wise sayings of this collection must be interpreted.

A similar condition obtains also in the Preacher of Solomon, or Ecclesiastes, a book that already by some of the early Jewish schools was declared to "contaminate the hands," i. e., was uncanonical, and which is claimed to be such by modern critical schools, especially because of its "Vanity of vanities: all is vanity" (Eccles. 1, 2; 12, 8), and its seeming pessimism and despair of God's providence, and apparently Sadducaic denial of the resurrection in Eccles. 11, 9*a* (is this passage irony?); 8, 15; 2, 24; 3, 12, 22; 5, 17; 3, 18-22. Yet back of the whole book is the Old Testament believer, from whose standpoint all the contents must be interpreted to mean that all such pessimism is the result of a lack of confidence in Jehovah. This is more than apparent from the summary of the teachings of the entire book, as given in Eccles. 12, 13-14; and from special statements in 5, 6; 7, 18, 29; 11, 9*b*; 3, 11-14; 12, 7. In the light of the whole context of thought even a doubt like that of Eccles. 3, 21 loses its harshness.

In the same way the context, taken in this wider sense and connected with the whole Biblical world of thoughts and ideals, give us the key to unlock the riddle of the Song of Songs, which on the surface may seem to be nothing but an ordinary love song of the human passion of King Solomon and the Shulammite woman (Cant. 1, 1; 6, 12), but which both the Old and the New Testament Church have always interpreted figuratively, either allegorically or typically, of the love between the Lord and His Church. Although it is nowhere

in so many words stated in this book that it has such a religious purpose, a Jewish reader (who knew of no erotic poetry) could never have thought of taking it in any other sense, as both in the Old and in the New Testament, the marriage relation or wedlock, as the relationship closer than even that of nature between parents and children (Mark 10, 7; (Gen. 2, 24) Eph. 5, 31), is one of the most popular figures to express the close communion between God and His people, and its violation in the shape of idolatry is often expressed in the language that signifies the breaking of the marriage bond (Ex. 34, 15, 16; Deut. 31, 16; Jud. 8, 33); and rather remarkably, the Prophet Hosea, by being commanded to marry a woman of whoredom and to beget children of whoredom, is, by a symbolical action, to proclaim the idolatry of Israel (Hos. 1, 1-9; 3, 1-5, cf. 1, 2). The Church is called the "bride of the Lamb," the bridegroom (Ps. 45, 10; John 3, 29; Rev. 19, 7; 21, 9; 22, 17; Matt. 25, 1; Eph. 5, 25). The figure of bridegroom and bride, as expressive of the love between the Lord and His church, was a part of the mental and spiritual makeup of the Israelites, and it would have been as impossible for them to interpret the Song of Songs otherwise as it would be for a modern Christian to interpret Pilgrims' Progress as history.

Again the interpretation of a larger section of the Bible in the light of its general context can be illustrated by the three great chapters in Romans, namely, 9, 10 and 11. These are not primarily doctrinal but aim to answer a historical problem, namely, the selection of Israel rather than any other nation to be the peculiar people of God. From this viewpoint the misinterpretation of these chapters as though they referred

to external election or predestination to eternal life would be excluded, as they actually treat of a problem of history.

In not a few cases the direct connection and context of separate passages show exactly what these passages really intended to mean. Thus Matt. 5, 39-42 teaches the lesson of non-resistance as characteristic of the New Covenant over against the law of retaliation as still taught in the Old (Matt. 5, 38; Ex. 21, 24; Lev. 24, 20), and by stating that we, if struck on the one cheek, should turn also the other, purposes to say as a principle, that we should be willing rather to suffer double wrong than to repay evil for evil. The same principle underlies the three cases that follow (vss. 40-42).

Again when Christ, in Matt. 10, 24-25, states that the pupil is not above his master nor the slave above his lord, the connection shows that He means to say that the disciples cannot expect any better treatment than had been accorded to Him. The disciples are here (vss. 1-42) given instructions for their first independent missionary tour. Again when in Matt. 9,16-17; Mark 2, 21; Luke 5, 36 Christ speaks of putting new cloth on an old garment and new wine into old bottles, as this is said in defense of the Apostles for not fasting after the manner of the disciples of the Pharisees and of John, this can mean only that the new Spirit of the Gospel is incapable of commingling with the teachings of their Jewish contemporaries, which, it will be remembered, was not based on Old Testament teachings but was a decadent departure from and a corruption of Moses and the Prophets, the legitimate interpreter and representative of whom was Christ Himself This

makes Luke 5, 39 to mean that the majority of the people of Christ's time still preferred the old Pharisaic heterodoxy to the truth as revealed in Christ.

Thus too when Christ, in Luke 12, 49, declares that He had come to causé a fire on earth, He can mean only a separation between the true believers and the Jewish heterodoxy, and He expresses the wish that that separation, which took place in the early church, were already a thing of His own time.

Passages that are often quoted separated from their context have in their context special meanings. Thus the question whether when the Lord comes to judgment He will find faith on earth (Luke 18, 8) in its connection is seen to mean whether He will find that amount or degree of faith, which in view of the willingness of God to hear our prayers, He will have a right to expect. Again, in the pericope concerning church discipline (Matt. 18, 15 sqq.), the connection shows that it is primarily the purpose here to gain a brother. Again it is the connection that explains statements seemingly not in harmony as when in Luke 11, 23 Christ states that he that is not for Him is against Him, and in Luke 9, 50 says that he who is not against Him is for Him. In the first case the object is to discriminate between the followers and the enemies of Christ; in the second case the purpose is to show that not all who are disciples of Christ need to be public representatives of this faith as were the Twelve. Again in I Cor. 3, 12 the connection shows — since all the workers are building on the true foundation of the church, Jesus Christ — that we are not dealing with two classes of workers, good and bad, orthodox and heretical, but with six classes of good workers, but all not equally good, there

being a difference in the quality of their work as in the case of the Parables of the ten minas and the five talents entrusted to His workers by Christ (Luke 19, 16-19; Matt. 25, 15-25). There is nothing in the context to show that the wood, hay and stubble — valuable in the Orient — are not acceptable though inferior workers in the Church. Again the "unbelieving generation," in Matt. 17, 17; Mark 9, 17; Luke 9, 41, are by the connection shown to be the disciples themselves. The seemingly harsh command of Christ (Matt. 8, 22), that the performance of the most sacred of human duties, namely, the burial of a dead parent, shall be left for those who are spiritually dead and who would not profit by association with Christ, is justified by the critical moment in the career of the questioner, who now was to decide between a higher and a lower duty. In Matt. 12, 31 sqq. the warning of Christ concerning the Sin against the Holy Ghost is occasioned by the blasphemy of the Pharisees, who had probably just committed this sin by declaring that Christ was driving out devils through Beelzebub, the prince of devils (Matt. 12, 24, sqq.). In I Cor. 10, vss. 26 and 28, the passage Ps. 24, 1 is twice quoted, but for a different purpose as indicated by the context. There is nothing in the context to show that John 21, 15 sqq. speaks of a "reinstatement" of Peter into his office as Apostle, which he is thought by many to have forfeited by his denial of the Lord. There is no hint here, or in Peter's relationship to Christ after the resurrection, to show that either he or the Lord thought that, after he had repented with tears, he still needed any reinstatement; and the threefold appeal to his love for the Lord in view of the Lord's answers doubtlessly

are to be a solemn warning to him who was soon to be the leader among the Apostles in the work of the gospel propaganda, as is seen to be the case in the opening chapters in Acts.

PART III

SPECIAL HERMENEUTICS

(187)

CHAPTER I

Fundamental Principle

As the Bible is an entirely unique literary production, constituting a class by itself and *sui generis,* and as its characteristic and peculiar feature is found in its inspiration, which secures for it divine and superhuman contents and an errorless expression of one body of truth, it follows that certain special rules, not used in the interpretation of other writings, may and must be applied. We have thus to deal not only with General but also with Special Hermeneutics.

All of the rules of Special Hermeneutics are the outcome and particular applications of the unique and fundamental principle of Protestant Hermeneutical writers: *"Scriptura ex Scriptura explicanda est"* — the self-interpreting character of the Holy Scriptures. To a certain extent the self-interpretation principle holds good in the explanation of any secular author, as Homer is under ordinary circumstances the best interpreter of Homer, and Virgil of Virgil. But with all this the limitations in the application of this rule in secular literature are self-evident from the fact that those writings are human in origin and as such are subject to human error and may be self-contradictory, inconsistent and report incorrectly. We can have no assurance that the historians Thucydides and Livy do not in one place say what contradicts that which they state elsewhere.

In the Scriptures there is no such a restriction of the self-interpreting principle, but its application is absolute because they are divine in origin and contents. This rule accordingly means that whatever the Scriptures say concerning themselves, their divine truth, harmony, unity, errorless contents, and the like, must be accepted as a basis with which all the rules of Hermeneutics used in their interpretation must be in complete agreement. The Bible does not give special rules for its interpretation, although in some cases, as in the use made of the Old Testament in the New, in the explanation given by Christ of two of His parables (Matt. 13, 18 sqq. and parallels, and Matt. 13, 36 sqq.), we have several instructive precedents for correct interpretation; the Bible, however, does give those facts and data concerning itself upon which all Biblical interpretation must be founded.

This conviction must be the "standpoint" of the Biblical Bible interpreter. It is his "principle" (principium = beginning) from which he starts, and which he holds as a subjective and personal conviction and from which there is no further appeal. A Bible scholar must in his researches accept a certain basis for his investigations, as indeed investigators must in every department of research, even the mathematician, who accepts but does not prove or demonstrate the fundamental ideas of space and their relations to each other. There is no such a thing as *"absolute Voraussetzungslosigkeit"* — an absolute absence of prejudgments or standpoint, in any sphere of human research. When Harnack in the Introduction to his History of Dogma says: "Der Historiker hat keinen Standpunkt," he states something in conflict with his own attitude and

what in the nature of the case is an impossibility. The fact that the Bible student starts out *a priori* from the presupposition that the Scriptures are inspired and hence errorless and at the same time *a posteriori* in any individual Biblical problem reaches the conclusion that in this particular case the Bible is correct, is not an *argumentum in circulo,* or *petitio principii* as has been seen above.

CHAPTER II

Analogy of the Scriptures and of Faith

Inasmuch as the Holy Scriptures enjoy the unique distinction of having practically one author only, and He the divine Spirit of truth, there results from this fact the special right of these writing to be interpreted in their own special light, so that all the teachings of the Bible on any particular subject should be interpreted in the light of the clear passage or passages on the same subject. As it is a well known fact that the Scriptures nowhere on any of its revealed contents give a purely *ex professo* discussion of any doctrine, even of the most essential such as of Grace and Faith, or the Person and Work of Christ, but at particular places give those phases and features of the doctrines only which were needed by the original readers of these writings to supplement, apply, enlarge upon, etc., that which they had already received on the same subjects by oral proclamation of the Prophets and the Apostles, it follows that these doctrinal revelations are given in the Bible piecemeal and in a certain sense fragmentary. The collection and proper harmonious and mutual adjustment of these particular and special teachings on any particular subject of great importance, especially those referring to the great fundamentals of faith, constitutes the Analogy of Faith on that doctrine, from which Analogy of Scriptures differs only in that it is the harmonious combined teaching of the Bible on non-funda-

mental problems, such as chronological, historical, archaeological and the like. Thus the summary of the Bible teachings on the subject of the Trinity, or of the Atonement, will belong to the Analogy of Faith, while a similar summary on such questions as the duration of the Babylonian Captivity, or of Christ's public ministry, belongs to the Analogy of the Scriptures. Naturally the latter is more comprehensive than the former, and logically even includes it, but the Analogy of Faith is so important a part of the Analogy of the Scriptures that it deserves to constitute a special class and division.

The extent to which the Scriptures will furnish the material for an analogy on any subject, be this of faith or otherwise, will depend both on the amount of such material to be found between the covers of the Bible, as also on the relative importance of this material, whether dealing with essential or with subordinate features of the subject, and further on the clearness of this material. Naturally if a subject is handled only once in the Scriptures, it is doubtful if we can speak of any analogy on that subject at all. This is, e. g., the case with the Cyrenius problem in Luke 2, 2 — one of the greatest of the kind in the Scriptures — which receives no further light from Acts 5, 37. Naturally there are scores of such subjects without analogy in all of these data of the historical books of the Old Testament, which are mentioned but once, interesting though they be, such as the abstinence of the Rechabites (Jer. 35, 6), although the name of the founder is mentioned (II Kings 10, 15); as also of all of those episodes in the life of Christ mentioned by only one gospel writer, as the Marriage at Çana (John 2, 1-11);

or the parable of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15, 11-32); or Paul's reference to the enigmatical "baptism" for the dead" (I Cor. 15, 29).

On other questions the material for the construction of the Biblical analogy is more or less meagre and the possibility of making it sufficient for anything like a rounded and logical statement on such subjects is not at hand, or only to a certain extent, and the result may not be a clear one. Thus Christ twice and in different connections (Matt. 19, 28; Luke 22, 30) tells His disciples that they are to participate in a very special way in the final judgment, namely, by sitting on twelve seats and judging the twelve tribes of Israel; and in I Cor. 6, 2-3 Paul reminds his readers that the saints are to judge the world including the wicked angels, a thought repeated in Rev. 3, 21, and possibly based on Dan. 7, 22. The specific functions of the saints in this connection are not mentioned, as are those of the angels in Matt. 13, 41; 25, 31 sqq.; I Thess. 4, 16, in this judgment. Just what is the rounded out analogy of the Scriptures on this participation of the disciples and of the saints in the final judgment is not clear in view of the clearly declared fact that all men without exception are themselves to be judged (Matt. 25, 32; Rom. 14, 10*b;* Acts 17, 31; II Cor. 5, 10). Naturally, too, the dark features in the first mentioned passages must have a meaning in harmony with the clear passages of the second group, but exactly what this meaning is, no legitimate principles of interpretation, such as context, parallelism and the like, seem able to make clear to the student.

The example illustrates the further fact that it is particularly in the field of eschatology and kindred mat-

ters, such as angelology, satanology, and the like, where the lack of material for satisfactory analogies is often painfully apparent. This is illustrated by a reference to the subject of Antichrist, of which the *sedes doctrinae* is II Thess. 2, 1 sqq. in connection with Dan. 11, 36 (7, 8); Apoc. 13, 5, to which other but perhaps irrelevant passages are sometimes added, as e. g., Rev. 12, 14; Matt. 24, 5 sqq.; I John 2, 18, 22; II John 7, etc. To the present day it is a matter of dispute among theologians as to what really constitutes the analogy of the Scriptures on the subject of the Antichrist.

Even on some doctrines of a most fundamental character the data for the construction of a dogma on that subject are meagre. This is, as is well known, the case with the great mystery of the Trinity, as far as the direct teachings of the Scripture are concerned, especially since I John 5, 7 is not genuine (Luther, too, never admitted it in his German translation of the New Testament, in which it was inserted after his death). The Biblical material for the Analogy on this article of faith is not taken chiefly from thetical statements, but from facts of revelation such as Matt. 3, 16-17; 28, 19; II Cor. 13, 13; Apoc. 1, 4-5.

Also on such an important subject as the Lord's Supper, the Scriptural material, while rich, is, from a systematic and constructive standpoint, comparatively meagre, being confined to Mark 14, 22-24; Matt. 26, 26-28; Luke 22, 19-20; I Cor. 11, 23-25, to which can be added I Cor. 10, 16-17; Acts 2, 42; 20, 7; all of which passages still leave unanswered some questions that a formally complete conception of this doctrine would seem to include; and even the noteworthy fact that the actual words of the institution are in all four sources ex-

actly alike adds nothing to the clearness of the subject as such. Mere verbatim repetition of the same thought contributes nothing to a clearer conception of the matter.

At times the construction of an analogy of Scriptures is not an easy matter. Thus in Matt. 5, 32; 19, 9 the Lord expressly states that there is only one ground for divorce, namely, adultery, and no passage could be clearer. Yet in Mark 10, 11-12; Luke 16, 18 there seems to be an absolute forbidding of divorce, while in I Cor. 7, 15 there is thought to be a second cause given for divorce. In the first two groups the difficulty is settled by the fact that the general statement must be interpreted in the light of the restricted; but it is doubtful if the passage in Corinthians is a parallel passage at all, or treats of divorce. It is hard to see how Christ, the Master, could say that there is only one cause for divorce and Paul, the pupil, state that there is a second; and further the technical term for divorce (λύω) is not used at all in Corinthians, and probably only separation is here meant; and again the Apostle speaks here specifically only of one particular case, namely, separation because of religious differences, and how this can be expanded to what is usually termed "willful desertion" in general is not so clear. Here the interpreter has the preliminary problem to solve, namely, whether he is dealing with parallel passages at all. Finding parallel passages where no parallelism exists has been the source of a good deal of eisegesis, as when John 6, 51 sqq. is regarded as treating of the Lord's Supper.

Again serious difficulties, not in doctrine but in external matters, may call for a solution by the application of this principle of the Analogy of the Scriptures. Thus it is repeatedly stated by the Synoptics that the last meal

which Christ ate with His disciples and as a supplement to which He instituted the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was the regular Jewish passover (Mark 14, 12; Luke 22, 7; Matt. 26, 17); while there are a number of passages in John's Gospel (especially 13, 1; 18, 28; 19, 14; 19, 31) from which it would appear that this meal was eaten on the evening preceding the Passover, so that this ancient Jewish rite and the New Testament Sacrament would not be historically connected at all. It is very evident that the passages in the Synoptics are the clear ones, and it is also a fact that the darker and seemingly contradictory passages in John can all be adjusted by ordinary rules of Hermeneutics to harmonize with the former. Thus the statement about "eating the Passover" (John 18, 28) with the historic τὸ πάσχα can φαγεῖν readily mean to "celebrate the Passover" in general, which celebration extended over a week, even if the Passover meal proper, with which this festival season began, had already been eaten.

At times in minor details the analogy of parallel passages is valuable in determining the exact meaning of a passage. Thus in Acts 13, 48 the phrase, "as many as were ordained to eternal life," might be taken as it stands as teaching absolute predestination, but the Analogy of Faith does not permit this. In the same way the two forms of the letter sent out by the Jerusalem congregation to the Gentile Christians giving the results of the declaration in the Apostolic Convention as reported in Acts 15 show that by the word idolatry (in itself it would be strange if it had been deemed necessary to admonish the new converts against idolatry at all), as seen in the light of vs. 29, is meant the more subtle form of idolatry found in partaking of meats

that had been sacrificed to idols, a problem that also perplexed the Corinthians seriously (cf. I Cor. 8, 1 sqq.).

The value of this principle of interpretation is generally more negative than positive. A clear parallel passage or parallel passages can tell the interpreter what a dark passage dare *not* mean, namely, that it dare not mean anything contrary to what the clear analogy of the Scriptures teaches on the same subject. But there may perhaps be several interpretations of a dark passage that would be in harmony with the clear teachings of the Scriptures on the subject under consideration; and the determination of which one of a number of possibly correct meanings is really the one intended by the writer, must be left to other rules of Hermeneutics, especially the context. Thus it is as clear as daylight from passages like Rom. 3, 24; Eph. 2, 8-9 that we are justified by faith alone, while James 2, 24 just as explicitly states that we are not justified by faith alone. Several very acceptable ways of harmonizing these seeming discrepancies have been offered, everyone in harmony with the Analogy of Faith; such as the different use made of the terms "faith" and "works" by the two Apostles; or of the term "justify," as is done by Melanchthon in the Apology; yet which is correct must be determined not by this analogy but within this analogy by the ordinary rules of Biblical interpretation. The analogy can tell us what a passage dare not and does not mean, but it cannot tell us what a passage actually must or does mean. The value of parallel passages lies rather in those features in which they disagree than in those in which they agree, as this is the case also with synonymous words, which are really a parallelism in individual ideas or thoughts. In John 14, 28 Christ says that the Father is

greater than He (greater than all things, John 10, 29); yet in John 10, 30 He had said "The Father and I are one." The connection still better than the analogy shows that these two seemingly contradictory terms speak of two relationships of the Father and the Son, the one in the actual redemptive work, in which the Son was obedient to the Father and in which there was accordingly subordination of Son to the Father, while the other implies the oneness of divinity and godship.

The passages viz.: Matt. 21, 9; Mark 11, 9; Luke 19, 38; John 12, 13 are not parallels to Matt. 27, 22; Mark 15, 13; Luke 23, 23, since those who on Palm Sunday greeted Christ with the Messianic salutation as they escorted Him into the city were probably Galilean pilgrims who had spent the night on the Mount of Olives and like Christ were entering the city to celebrate the feast, and were accordingly not the same as those who cried "Crucify Him," these latter being the Jerusalem rabble stirred up by the representatives of the Hierarchy (Matt. 27, 30; Mark 15, 11).

CHAPTER III

Reason in Interpretation

Another distinctive feature of Biblical interpretation growing out of the *sui generis* character of the Scriptures is the restriction and limitation that must be placed on human reason and the power of the mind in general in interpreting and comprehending its contents. In general, both in philosophical and theological thought, such limitations are being more and more recognized *on all sides;* but the importance of this in Bible research is particularly to be recognized. Just as the human body with its physical powers is limited in the exercise of its activities and is as nothing compared with the omnipotence of God, with whom all things are possible (Luke 18, 27; Matt. 19, 26); thus too the human mind is restricted in its efforts to appropriate, understand and conceive the thoughts that eminated in the mind of the infinite God. Revelation is in this sense a μυστήριον (Rom. 11, 34; I Cor. 2, 10 sqq.; Eph. 3, 3 sqq.; II Cor. 10, 5; Col. 2, 3-4, 8). In a sense quite different from that in which it is used in the history of theology, the old dictum is here true *"finitum non est capax infiniti."* As it is stated in I Cor. 2, 14 (John 8, 47) the things of God can be understood only "spiritually," i. e., with the aid of the same Spirit in the hearts of men, who originally gave these revelations.

It is indeed true that in the Scriptures there are to be found hundreds of statements, dealing with external

matters, that naturally fall to the province of man to grasp with the mental powers that God has given him, such as historical, geographical, topographical, archaeological, biographical and the like, and these things even the natural man can fully and completely grasp as facts. The contents of the historical books of both the Old and the New Testament are largely of this character, although the deeper significance and meaning of these facts may not be recognized by the natural man. Thus the genealogical lists in the opening chapters of I Chron. mean for the believing student of the Word the theocratic line of descent in Israel, and hence have a significance for him not grasped by the unbeliever. The same is true of the genealogies of Christ (Matt. 1, 1-16 and Luke 3, 23-38).

Even of doctrinal statements the natural man can attain a certain conception at times by attaching to the words their ordinary meanings. Thus in John 3, 16 he can form some conception of what the word "God," "love" and "world" mean, but only the Christian who has experienced the great truth here expressed can grasp the full meaning as intended by the evangelist. The latter gets more than the *sensus literae.* Men will pray "Our Father," and claim that they abide by the behests of the Sermon on the Mount, yet of the spirit of these things, they have no conception.

Human reason in the interpretation of the Scriptures can be used only as an instrument and a vehicle for the purpose of drawing out of the Scriptures what the holy men of God put there through the Spirit; but reason cannot be used as a source to supply anything not found in the Scriptures themselves. This is the formal and not the material use. This is the case in regard to

all the teachings of the Scriptures but particularly of those deeper revelations that deal with the facts concerning God, Christ, His person and work, the truths of grace, faith, predestination, eternal life — of which the human mind can form at best only very meagre mental concepts or pictures — these being by their nature and origin, above and beyond the sphere in which the mind of man is created to live and move. These things we know only "in part" (I Cor. 13, 9-10; II Cor. 5, 7). Even the keenest intellect can go no further; which, however, naturally means that the degree to which we can grasp a Bible revelation intellectually is not at all the measure to which we can appreciate, or utilize its soteriological and spiritual significance; rather the opposite often seems to be the case.

It is significant how in the Scriptures often the attempt is made by the human mind to grasp and formulate those divine things which are naturally above and beyond it. Thus, e. g., the leading attribute of God is holiness; yet the Scriptural conception of holiness, קָדוֹשׁ and ἅγιος, is largely negative, implying the negation and elimination of all those attributes and weaknesses in man which put him in contrast to God's holiness. Of the perfection of God only a meagre conception can be formed by anthropomorphisms, God being a spirit, as when we speak of God's "finger," or "hand," or "eye"; or by anthropopathies, as when we describe the attitude of God after the manner of what we conceive to be similar processes in man, and say that He "repented," or that He was "angry," or "hates," and the like.

The limitations and restrictions of reason in Biblical exegesis must not be ignored in the adjustment of in-

dividual teachings of the Scriptures to each other. The Bible does not always link together in a harmony that appeals to human reason the distinctive doctrines which it teaches. The fact is that revealed facts do not always stand toward each other in that relationship which we call logical. Thus it is plainly taught in the Scriptures that Christ as God has the divine attribute of omniscience, and a logical conclusion from this would be that He knows all things, yet He distinctly tells us that He does not know the day of judgment, Matt. 24, 36 (I Thess. 5, 1 sqq.); again from the fact that He is God it is logical to conclude that by virtue of His omnipotence He could do all things, yet in Matt. 20, 23; Mark 10, 40 He says that His powers are limited. If then the different truths that are actually revealed do not always stand to each other in what is regarded as logical relation according to the laws of the human mind, we certainly have no right to conclude that those things which are not revealed stand in such a relation to the things that are revealed. Thus the ignorance of Christ concerning the day of judgment is sometimes explained as an ignorance according to His human nature only. This may be so; but we do not know if it actually is so and cannot know, for it has not been revealed. In all such non-revealed connecting links we must say *"Ignoramus; ignorabimus,"* and confine ourselves strictly to what has been made known to us, as the human mind has no call or power in Scriptural interpretation beyond the reproduction of Biblical thoughts, their adjustment to each other by purely formal use of its powers, and by the analysis of the contents of the things revealed, without however adding one scintilla of thought to what is actually given in the Word, even if what we would add is in strict har-

mony with the Analogy of Faith. Thus in the temptation of Christ (Matt. 4, 1-11; Mark 1, 12-13; Luke 4, 1-13) it must be claimed that Christ really could have yielded to the tempter, otherwise it would not have been a real test; and on the other hand, that being God, He could not have fallen. The theological explanation that the abstract possibility of falling was at all stages counteracted by the concrete impossibility, meets the requirements of the Analogy of Faith, but it is not revealed if this is the solution of this mystery. A rationalistic orthodoxy or an orthodox rationalism is just as wrong in principle as is a rationalistic heterodoxy. When the Biblical data are themselves sufficient to supply the links to connect the individual statements in the Scriptures, as they are in regard to such passages as "The Father is greater than I," and "I and the Father are one," it is the Scriptural material and not the logical deductions — correct as these may be — from Biblical premises, that furnish these links.

It is further a fact that various deductions from Scriptural facts may be equally logical and equally in harmony with the Analogy of Faith, and there are no means of knowing which one of such extra-Biblical conclusions would be correct. Thus the doctrine of the inspiration of the Bible as a fact is plainly taught in the Scriptures, but not what the process was. It might be equally logical to say it was by dictation, or by the adaptation of the Spirit to the individual peculiarities of the different writers; but which of these is actually correct we have no means of knowing, as nothing has been revealed on this question.

The place and province of reason, in developing the contents and teachings of the Scriptures, is thus purely

formal and instrumental, but never material, which means that no subject matter or material for Bible interpretation is to be furnished by reason or research; and even if, for instance, archaeological finds such as the Babylonian cuneiform literature furnish parallels to the Biblical story of creation, the deluge and the like, these may indeed throw some light on certain details, but they do not "confirm" the Bible accounts of these matters, in the sense that they make these latter more sure than they would have been without these parallels. Archaeological and oriental sidelight data are interesting and instructive, as is also speculative theology, but the minute these in any respect go beyond what is written they add to the Biblical and are a violation not only of the Scriptures but also of the formal principle of the Reformation.

CHAPTER IV

Prophecy and Its Interpretation

As Biblical prophecy is an entirely unique phenomenon, having nothing in common with the seemingly kindred things in the heathen religions, such as the oracles, mantic art and the like, the application of special rules to its interpretation is a self-evident matter. Both the etymology of the word "prophecy" (which really has nothing to do with the term προφήτης, but is based on the word נָבִיא , one that gushes forth), as also the present use of the word, are misleading in so far as the determination of the Biblical idea of prophecy or prophet is concerned. Prophecy is a common phenomenon of both the Old and the New Testament, for in the latter not only are prophets, and even prophetesses (Acts 21, 9), and prophecy repeatedly mentioned as factors in the Apostolic Church, but, in general, Christ and the Apostles were in the New Testament Church what the Prophets were in the Old. The fundamental conception of prophecy in both Testaments is this, that the prophet was the instrument, and organ or agent or vehicle chosen by God to be the medium for conveying new revelation to man. First and foremost the prophet was a preacher for his own times and contemporaries; and prediction and specifically Messianic prophecy, which for later ages of the church came to be the chief feature particularly of Old Testament prophecy, was rather an accidental and

incidental feature of this activity. All prophecy is naturally in a certain sense predictive in so far as it makes known to the contemporaries of the prophet the will and wish of God, but in many, or most cases, it is the prediction of the immediate or near future as a motive for determining the conduct of the people in the present, that is before the eyes of the prophet, and predictive prophecy in the sense of Messianic announcement of the advent and the work of Christ is found only in certain portions of some of the Old Testament prophets. In one respect this Messianic feature can be expected to be a prominent feature in Old Testament prophecy, as the Old Covenant was not in itself a finality but only a preparation for the New, just as the New Covenant is also not a finality but a preparation for the Church Triumphant, and the prophetical books of the Old Testament bear that relation to the New Testament, which the prophecies and the one prophetic book of the New Testament, Revelation, bear to the Church Triumphant.

Prophecy is as old as the Bible itself; or rather older, being as old as the Kingdom of God — the development of which the Bible is the official record. In II Pet. 2, 5 it is said that Noah was a prophet, or a preacher; in Gen. 20, 7 Abraham is called a prophet; Aaron in Ex. 7, 1; the order of prophets is presupposed in Num. 12, 6; Deut. 18, 15; 34, 10, where Moses is so called because he revealed the will of God chiefly as a legislator, as often in the Old Testament; in Luke 7, 16 Christ is called a prophet because of His miracles. (Cf. Luke 13, 33; 24, 19; John 4, 19; 6, 14; etc.). Among the gifts possessed by the early church was that of prophecy, i. e., certain of the early Christians were

used by God as mediums for transmitting to the church new revelations and truths, but it is also particularly declared that this is not to remain a permanent gift of the church; there were also some other gifts that were to be lost, e. g., the gift of tongues (I Cor. 13, 8). These gifts are the theme of I Cor. 12, 1 sqq. and Paul places the gift of prophecy above all others, even the gift of tongues (I Cor. 14, 5, 22), and in vs. 22 sqq. he assigns precedence to the prophet in public services.

That in the Old Testament the prophets were preeminently the men of God for their own day and date, and the agents through whom Jehovah guided the development of the theocracy, is clear particularly from the fact that some of the leading prophets of whom we have any records — notably Elias, in the New Testament the typical and representative prophet of the Old Covenant (Matt. 17, 3, 4, 11; 11, 14), and Elisha — only to a very limited extent deal with the future and then only with the immediate future. From neither of these two great men of God have we any Messianic predictions, as is seen from the exceptionally extensive account of their careers, extending from I King 17, 1 to II Kings, 13, 14 — more than eighteen chapters, which say nothing of the coming Messianic age. Again even of the literary remains that we possess of the sixteen prophets (out of hundreds that were active in the history of the Children of Israel), represented in the Old Testament Canon (including Daniel, not counted as a prophetic book in the Hebrew arrangement of the Canon, but from our viewpoint, concerned chiefly as it is about the relation of prophecy to Christ, one of the greatest of all), by far the largest amount of material deals with the problems and perplexities of their

own times and relatively the smaller portion consists of Messianic predictions. The largest body of prophecies of the latter kind is found in the second part of Isaiah, chapters 40-66, where the conception of the "Servant of the Lord," although not treating exclusively of the Messiah, yet culminates in the Messiah; and the author accordingly bears the title of "Evangelist of the Old Testament," particularly because of that gem, Isaiah, chapter 53, dealing with the fact and the significance of the passion and death of Christ. Next in riches from the Messianic standpoint are Daniel and Zechariah, the latter "the prophet of the Passion week," even supplementing the contents of Is. 53 in chap. 11, 13; 12, 15 (cf. Dan. 9, 26), by showing the guilt of Israel in this calamity. In the other prophetic writings the Messianic element is restricted generally to individual and special facts, even in the first part of Isaiah, where a considerable number of these are found, e. g., Is. 7, 14; 9, 6, while in Micah 5, 1, the important fact of the birthplace of the Messiah is mentioned, and in Joel 3, 1 sqq. the coming of the day of the Lord and the Pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit are predicted (cf. Is. 32, 15; Acts 2, 16). Even such an extensive book as that of Jeremiah deals almost exclusively with the problems of the hour, and its strictly Messianic element is relatively small and rather of a general nature, such as the prediction of a better covenant (31, 31-34; cf. Heb. 8, 8, and his battlecry of "Jahveh our righteousness" is possibly supplementary to the Immanuel of Is. 7, 14; 8, 8, 10). Jeremiah is the great statesman of his age, whose advice, however, was unpopular and the failure to heed which led to the de-

struction of the city and the temple. In Ezekiel, even with his vision of the new temple (chaps. 40-48), the direct Messianic elements are rather of a secondary character, and he too dealt chiefly with the problem of his immediate present. In other prophetic writings a similar condition prevails: Obadiah (vs. 17; cf. Joel 3, 5; 4, 17, 21; Is. 14, 32; 24, 23) speaks of Zion as a common place of refuge at the judgment; Habakkuk is the prophet of faith, chap. 2, 1 sqq. (where 2, 4 is the original source of Paul's "justification by faith alone," Rom. 1, 17; Gal. 3, 11; Heb. 10, 38); Haggai predicts the superior glory of the second temple (Hag. 2, 9); Malachi announces the forerunner of the Messiah (ch. 3, 23-24). Not a small portion of these utterances of the Minor Prophets deals with the religious, social and political problems of the hour, announcing especially the comfort for the people in view of the impending captivities, as is done by Hosea, Micah, Nahum, Zephaniah. Sometimes special problems are considered, as is the "graft" in the higher circles of Israel in Micah, or the real reformation to be inaugurated by Jehovah as contrasted to the failure of that under Josiah, as explained by Zephaniah.

An indication of the fact that there were hundreds of prophets in Israel from whom we have no literary remains whatever, is found in the fact that there were "schools" of prophets already in the days of Samuel (cf. I Sam. 9, 10; 19, 20 sqq.); as also in the days of Elias (cf., e. g., I Kings 19, 21; II Kings 5, 21); and John the Baptist, Jesus, Paul and other Apostles each had their pupils. What we accordingly still possess of the disclosures of the "literary prophets," as opposed to the "prophets of action," who spoke and

preached but did not write, is only a relatively small selection of what the prophets themselves did and in particular too of what these "literary" prophets said and did. Thus Hosea's activity (Hos. 1, 1) extended over a period of sixty years, yet we possess only fourteen chapters of these six decades. Isaiah (cf. Is. 1, 1) was also active about the same length of time and the sixty-six chapters retained in his collection of prophecies is at best only a chrestomathy of the hundreds of sermons he doubtlessly delivered, just as the gospels contain with anything like completeness only one sermon of Jesus. Naturally Obadiah's activity must have included much more than the one single chapter — and that directed against an outside nation, Edom — which we find in this book. All these and scores of kindred facts go to show that when the prophets preached they had perhaps little thought of serving distant and unborn generations, but they felt that their first mission was to serve as men of God their own times and people. Just why out of their countless discourses that extended from before the foundation of the Jewish Theocracy down to the very close of the Old Testament period, in the providence of God, just those discourses by these few prophetic men, including not one from the earliest centuries of prophecy but all clustering around the decline and fall of Israel, should have been preserved for the good of the church in preference to all the others that have been lost, is a question that can perhaps not be answered; just as it can scarcely be answered why in the New Testament just certain and not other details of Christ's career and teachings have been preserved and why only the few letters found in the New Testament Canon have been retained in preference to others

doubtlessly written by the other Apostles and to those letters of the Apostles referred to in the New Testament, which have been lost, cf. I Cor. 5, 9; possibly II Pet. 3, 1, while II Thess. 2, 2; 3, 17*b* presupposes that Paul must have written a number of letters before this, although the letter he is now sending to the Thessalonians is only the second of the thirteen or fourteen from his pen found in the New Testament collection.

Concerning the prophets too, as was the case with the Apostles, we know only that they were directed to preach and not to write. Only in one case do we hear that the discourses of a prophet were to be collected in written form (although in the case of the other Major Prophets there are not a few data to show that their books were carefully edited), namely Jer. 36, 2; but it is at once seen that this was primarily intended for the benefit of the contemporaries of the prophet himself (as were also the gospels and the letters of the New Testament primarily for the Christians of the Apostolic Age); and he directs Baruch, his amanuensis, vss. 4-5—since the prophet himself was a prisoner in his own house — and orders him to read it publicly in the house of the Lord on the Fast Day (cf. vs. 7). When this leads to the burning of the book by the enraged king (vs. 23), Jeremiah (vs. 32) prepares a second and larger edition of his prophecies.

This outline survey of the origin, purpose and character of Biblical prophecy will enable us to interpret this species of revelation in all those cases where such an interpretation is still possible. For as this must be done in the light of the historical background of the occasion that called it forth, of its lessons for the original recipients, it is evident that prophecy can be explained only

in so far as its historical setting can more or less completely and accurately be reproduced. To understand a prophetic utterance it is not chiefly necessary to ask what it may signify for later generations of the church, but primarily what it meant for those to whom it was addressed. That all such utterances must have had such a meaning for the contemporaries of the speaker, lies in its very genius, and it cannot be said that there are any purely academic prophecies, i. e., those spoken only for the benefit of future generations and that were meaningless for their own, although in many cases the full significance of such meanings become clear only to the former. Thus the protevangelium (Gen. 3, 15) or the promises given to Abraham (Gen. 22, 17 and often) were but hazy in the minds of the original recipients, as was also the Shiloh prophecy in Gen. 49, 10, and their full import was only recognized in the New Testament. But on the other hand many of the Old Testament prophecies are more hazy to us than they were to the original recipients, because to them the historical background was known and clear while to us it is not. Take, e. g., those three groups of prophecies that treat of the heathen nations surrounding Israel, as these are found in Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, and further than the principles of God's providence that these concrete cases illustrate, these chapters are largely beyond our ken. Thus the predictions against Moab in Is. 15 and 16; or against Damascus and Israel in chap. 17; or Ethiopia in chap. 18, or Egypt in chap. 19; or Assyria in chap. 20, or Babylon in chap. 21, are in their details beyond the horizon of the exegete, because we are no longer in possession of the historical facts in the case. To interpret these and similar prophecies of distant future events

with which they stand in no historic connection, such as the great wars of the medieval and modern times, is based upon an entire misapprehension of the character and purpose of Old Testament prophecies. Such events could possibly have been foreshadowed by the New Testament book of prophecy, the Apocalypse, but not in that of the Old, which looks only to the New Testament as the latter does to the final consummation of all things. Which among the Old Testament prophecies were intended to have a special significance also for the future generations of the church is seen only from the actual fulfillment of these as announced in the New. Thus Is. 7, 14 must have had a deep significance for King Ahaz and his contemporaries in showing them, in a manner no longer understood by us, that Jehovah would right speedily deliver them from the danger threatening Jerusalem from the Syrians and the Northern Kingdom; but Matt. 1, 23 teaches us that for future generations it had the still deeper significance of the virgin birth of the Messiah. Whether this latter fact was also known to the original recipients of this prophecy is not apparent, and it is hard to see how, if this was the case, it would have been in any way a comfort for the Israelites in view of the historical events that called forth this prophecy.

In other cases where the significance of a prophecy is of prime importance for later generations in the church it is not clear what it would have meant for the times of the prophets. This is, e. g., the case with Micah 5, 1 where the birth of Christ in Bethlehem is announced. It is out of the question to say that here merely the abstract fact is announced that the Messiah was to be born in the city of David, without there being

something in this announcement for the hearers of Micah, but exactly what this was is not apparent to us from the connection. The same is true of such passages as Zech. 9, 9, fulfilled in Matt. 21, 5, but by the connection shown to have some direct bearing on the times of the prophet. The same, though possibly not in the same degree, is true of the prophecies in Ps. 110, 1 sqq. quoted by Christ (Matt. 22, 44-46 and parallels) to prove His divinity from the Old Testament (cf. Heb. 10, 12 sqq., also Heb. 5, 6; 6, 20; 7, 17).

One of the most remarkable features of predictive prophecy is the fact that the entire future appears to the seer's vision as one and that events in themselves chronologically far apart are blended together as one. The preaching of John the Baptist illustrates this, since those extracts that are found in the Synoptic gospels treat of the second coming of Christ while those found in the Gospel of John of His first coming. In Christ's own teachings this same feature can be observed. Thus when He sends out the disciples for the first time on an independent missionary tour (Matt. 10, 1 sqq.; Mark 6, 6-13; Luke 9, 1-6), His instructions are first for the immediate future as is indicated by the fact that they are not to extend their work to Samaria and the Gentile nations but to limit their labors to Israel (Matt. 10, 5-6 — Matt. 15, 24; Acts. 13, 46); but almost imperceptibly He glides into the distant future and gives them instructions for their later mission as evangelists of the world, according to Matt. 28, 19-20. The same is true of His great eschatological addresses spoken when He left the temple for the last time on the Tuesday of the Passion week, as recorded in Matt. 24, 1-42; Mark 13, 1-37; Luke 21, 5-36. Some of these statements evidently re-

fer to the final judgment, as Matt. 24, 14; Mark 13, 10; while in the immediate vicinity of these statements other verses are found that must refer to the near future, as Matt. 24, 16; Mark 13, 14, 24; while, in Matt. 24, 34; Mark 13, 10; Luke 21, 32, He again refers to the destruction of Jerusalem, which the generation of His day was yet to witness and which as the final judgment of God on Israel as the chosen people of God, who had failed in their mission, is a part of the last judgment.

It is this feature of prophecy that doubtessly also explains the further fact that predictive prophecy rarely makes any accurate announcements as to the exact time of the fulfillment. The entire Second Part of Isaiah (chap. 40-66), with its rich gospel declarations, nowhere directly or indirectly gives any hint as to the number of decades or centuries that are to elapse before these things are to be fulfilled, nor does Micah 5, 1 say a word as to the exact time when Christ was to be born in Bethlehem. Even the vision of the Fourth Kingdom as the period of the advent of the Messiah, and such passages as Dan. 9, 25-26 and those of chap. 10 are quite indefinite in point of time, as are also the predictions in the Apocalypse. Christ pursues exactly the same method in regard to the time of His return, declaring even that He knew not the day of judgment (Matt. 24, 36; Mark 13, 32). Significantly when asked about this matter He never gives a direct reply but constantly directs the Apostles to be ready for the Lord at any time (Matt. 24, 42; 25, 13); and His last instructions given to them were in this same vein (Acts. 1, 7). Occasionally but only rarely are exact dates given of fulfillment in predictive prophecy and then doubtlessly for practical purposes of encouragement, and the like, as

when, in Gen. 15, 13 sqq., the four hundred years of Egypt are mentioned and it is repeatedly stated, probably to comfort the exiles, that the captivity is to endure only seventy years (Jer. 25, 11; 29, 10; II Chron. 36, 21; Esther 1, 1; Dan. 9, 2); Is. 23, 15 states that Tyre will be forgotten seventy years; II Kings 8, 1 announces a famine of seven years in Israel (cf. II Sam. 24, 13*a*); Joseph predicts the duration of the years of plenty and of famine in Egypt (Gen. 41, 26 sqq.); Christ repeatedly tells His disciples that He would be in the grave three days, but in these cases adds also the statement that He would rise again (Matt. 16, 21; Mark 8, 31; Luke 9, 22; Matt. 17, 23; Mark 9, 31; Matt. 20, 19; Mark 10, 34; Luke 18, 33).

It is possibly this characteristic of prophecy that explains the enigmatical chap. 7 of I Corinthians in which Paul gives a certain advice to the different classes in Corinth respecting marriage, which is largely influenced by his conviction that the day of the Lord is near at hand (cf. vss. 26, 29, 31), a feeling that underlies a number of his admonitions and statements (e. g., I Thess. 4, 17; I Cor. 15, 51).

In regard to the fulfillment of predictive prophecy it must be noted that if the prophecy is entirely based on the will and grace of God, as are the great promises of redemption, the fulfilment is absolute and sure; if in any way the prophecy is conditioned by the conduct of men, it is not to be regarded as absolute. Thus in Gen. 18, 16 sqq. the fate of Sodom is made conditional on the presence of a certain number of good men in that city; and as this condition could not be fulfilled, its doom was sealed. On the other hand the people of Nineveh (Jonah 3, 10) complied with the conditions

of the Lord, and the announced prophecy was not fulfilled. It is by no means sure that all the Old Testament predictions were really fulfilled or ever will be, as possibly the conditional feature in many of them led to the removal of the danger that they contained. The curse on Jericho (Josh. 6, 26) forbidding its rebuilding evidently referred not to the city as such but to it as a fortress, for in Josh. 18, 21 the city was assigned to Benjamin, and the fulfillment of the curse is recorded in I Kings 16, 34.

In regard to the logical relation of Old Testament prediction and New Testament fulfillment, it must be noted that the latter does not take place because of the former, but the prediction takes place because in the Omniscience of God it is foreseen that in the normal course of events this thing will take place. In John 13, 18 and Acts 1, 16 it is declared that the treachery of Judas was a fulfillment of the prophecy announced in Ps. 41, 9. Judas did not, as it were under compulsion so that this prophecy might be fulfilled, do this nefarious deed; but because God foreknew that he would do it, the Spirit predicted it through the words spoken by David. The same is true of all the prophecies cited in the New Testament from the Old, even with the formula "In order that they should be fulfilled" (e. g., Matt. 1, 22; 2, 15; 4, 14, etc., cf. Acts 2, 16 with Joel 3, 1 sqq.); and Christ on His way to Emmaus probably explained to the two disciples such passages as Deut. 18, 15; Ps. 22; Is. 53; yet the "must" in Luke 24, 26 (ἔδει) implies no physical necessity but of moral duty arising out of the voluntary assumption of the redemption work, and the relation of prophecy to fulfillment is the same as in such other passages as Acts 2, 34 (Ps. 110, 1); Acts 2, 24, 27; 13, 35 (Ps. 16, 10).

CHAPTER V

Types

By types are to be understood all those persons and things in the Old Testament which according to the purpose of the Holy Ghost as expressed in the New Testament were intended to and did prefigure and foreshadow certain persons and things, all factors in the development of the Kingdom of God, in the New Testament, these latter being called Antitypes. Types can thus be called prophetic persons and things, and the Typology of the Scriptures is thus closely related to prophecy, and perhaps more closely connected with the symbolical actions of some of the prophets. The New Testament declares that the entire Old Testament economy and its institutions are a "shadow," of which the substance and the reality is in the New Testament (Col. 2, 16-17; Heb. 8, 5); but this relationship is said to have existed specifically in certain individual cases. These types can be divided into five classes: viz., 1) Persons such as Adam (Rom. 5, 14, 19; I Cor. 15, 45), Elijah (Matt. 11, 14; 17, 11), Abraham (Gen. 15, 6); as also such men as Melchizedek, Joseph, Moses, Joshua, David, Solomon, Zerubabel; 2) Typical Institutions, particularly in Levitical services and rites, such as the lamb, Lev. 17, 11 (Heb. 9, 28), the Sabbath (Heb. 4, 7), the cities of refuge (Num. 35, 9-36), the Passover (Zech. 14, 19); 3) Typical offices, such as the prophetic office of Moses pointing to Christ (Deut.

18, 5), the same of the priests, especially the High Priest, typical of the person and work of Christ (Heb. 4, 14-16; 9, 11-14), Melchizedek, as the king of righteousness and peace as a type of Christ's office (Heb. 7, 2), and the same is true of David (Ps. 27); 4) Typical Events, especially the deluge, the Exodus out of Egypt, the sojourn in the wilderness, the giving of manna, the water from the rock, the uplifting of the brazen serpent, the conquest of Canaan (cf. I Cor. 10, 11); 5) Typical Actions, as Jonah's stay in the belly of the great fish (Matt. 12, 39, 40 (16, 4); Luke 11, 29); while other events, such as Isaiah's walking naked and barefoot three years (Is. 20, 2-4), or Jeremiah's taking and hiding a girdle in the Euphrates (Jer. 13, 1-11), his going to a potter's house and watching the work there (Jer. 18, 1-6), his breaking the potter's bottle in the valley of Hinnom (Jer. 19, 1 sqq.), and kindred actions, are not in the New Testament declared to be typical. In the New Testament there is even of such action only one example, that is Acts 21, 10-14.

In the interpretation of types care must be taken to regard as types only those persons and things which are declared to be such by the New Testament, and often termed *typi innati.* Not imaginations or even similarities, or *typi illati,* must decide this matter, but only the actual statements of the New Testament. Then these types are to be taken as such only in so far as the *tertium comparationis* goes and is shown by the Scriptures. David in his royal office is a type of Christ, but not in his sin with Bath-sheba; Aaron is a type of Christ in the highpriestly office but not when he made the golden calf. Sometimes this relationship is involved

in exegetical difficulties as when Melchizedek in Heb. 7, 3 "without father and mother" is a type of Christ.

The practical benefit of types for exegesis is slight, although the subject itself invites speculation and even phantasy. Yet a type can have no meaning beyond that which the antitype clearly teaches, and thus adds nothing to the latter. The study of types rather serves to illustrate the unity of the two Testaments and the fact that in these there is only one harmonious plan of salvation; and, secondly, goes to show that there has been growth and development in the revelation of God in the Scriptures.

CHAPTER VI

Parables

Etymologically the word Parable, from παραβάλλω, signifies the placing together of two or more objects for the purpose of comparison. In this widest sense of the term it is practically the same as a Simile or Metaphor, after the manner of the "Proverbs" in the Old Testament, which book could easily be called "Parables." This is what substantially some of the Parables of Christ are, being limited to a single comparison on a single verse, as Matt. 13, 33, 34, 45, 47; Luke 13, 6. In the more usual and technical sense of the term the word Parable signifies an imaginary story, yet one that in most of its details could actually have transpired, the outspoken purpose of the story being to illustrate some higher spiritual truth. This feature differentiates it from other and similar figurative narratives, such as fables, riddles, and the like, as also from true history. The Parable is nearest akin to rhetorical allegory, differing from it chiefly in its limited length and its specific Biblical and spiritual purposes. No one would think of calling an allegory of the length of "Pilgrim's Progress" a Parable; and in actual use this latter word is generally restricted to Christ's picture stories and their imitations. Again the similarities between Parable and actual history is so great that at times there may be doubt whether a certain pericope is the one or the other. This is, e. g., the case with the story of Dives and Lazarus (Luke 16,

19-31). The difference is a serious one; for if accepted as history every detail of the story must be interpreted, even the close connection between heaven and hell, while if it is a parable the exegete's task is easier. The probabilities that it is a parable are further increased by the occasion that called it forth, being a reply to the mockery of Christ by the greedy Pharisee (Luke 16, 14); and the purpose is to picture the fate of the rich man, since, as is too often the case in the Bible, and here too, the term rich is equivalent to the term "wicked," and the term "poor" to "godly."

Christ is indeed not the inventor of Parables, for such are found already in the Old Testament (e. g., II Sam. 12, 1-14; Is. 5, 1-6; 28, 24-28); and the Jews too made use of these rhetorical pictures (cf. Trench's "Notes on the Parables," Introductory Essay, chap. 4, for examples), but yet Christ was the only and unequalled teacher of Parables, and no other books in the New Testament contain these except the Synoptic gospels, with possibly one or two exceptions in John, such as the Good Shepherd (John 10, 12 sqq.). There is some uncertainty as to the exact number of Parables we still possess of the many which Christ spoke to His Disciples (Matt. 8, 34, where the dative "to the multitudes" means "in the presence of" the multitude, for it is certain that the Parables, while often spoken in the presence of a promiscuous audience, were intended solely for the instruction of the disciples, e. g., Matt. 13, 36; Mark 4, 10; also Matt. 12, 10-11; Luke 8, 10). In two cases, namely, the Marriage of the King's Son and the Great Supper, on the one hand, and the Talents and the Pounds on the other, it is uncertain, whether we have here two duplicates or four separate Parables. Again it

is uncertain whether certain pericopes, such as Luke 10, 30 sqq. (the Good Samaritan; 11, 5-12), are intended to be Parables, their contents indeed complying with the idea of a Biblical Parable, but there being no external indications that they were intended to be such (also cf. Luke 13, 6-9.).

The Parables of Christ are not found scattered over His three years of public ministry, but are found in two groups, spoken at two different times and at two places. The first group, dating from about the middle of the second year and spoken about the same time when He delivered the Sermon on the Mount, and like the latter delivered in Galilee, probably near Capernaum, are found in Matt. 13, 1-53; Mark 4, 1-25 and Luke 8, 4-18, and consists of seven different parables with a formal conclusion (Matt. 13, 53), showing that they were not collected from various discourses and times but were spoken together. Then we read of no further Parables of Christ, until toward the close of the third year of His activity, in Perea, and in and around Jerusalem, beginning perhaps with those of Matt. 18, 25-35 and Luke 18, 1-14, and extending to and through the third day of the Passion week, so full of discussion and controversy with the Pharisees, the Herodians, and the Sadducees (Matt. 21, 23 sqq.; Mark 11, 27 sqq.; Luke 20, 1 sqq.).

That the introduction of the Parables was a surprise innovation for the disciples themselves, is clear from their question as to the reasons for this change (Matt. 13, 10 sqq. and parallels); and the answer He gives there, based on Is. 6, 9-10, shows that their purpose was both to reveal and to conceal thought, the former for the disciples, the latter for the people in general.

As is the case in the Sermon on the Mount it must be here remembered that Christ's dealings with the people and particularly with the Jewish hierarchy had reached this stage that He was turning, as His only hope for winning real followers, from the people at large and was now beginning to confine Himself to His disciples with His instructions, who through these Parables were to be further instructed in the mysteries of the Kingdom of God, and hence the proper solution for any parable can be found just as soon as we can determine just what particular lesson Christ wanted by such a Parable to teach His disciples. As He was at this time beginning to prepare them for their work as Apostles (they had just shortly before this been called to this office, Matt. 10, 20 sqq. and parallels) and the subjects of all of these Parables naturally have to do with the instruction of the Apostles on this work, either with regard to certain characteristics of the Gospel they were to preach, or with regard to the transfer of the interests of the Kingdom of God that soon was to be taken from its former stewards, the Jewish church and its hierarchy, and to be assigned to others, in this case first of all to the New Testament church of which they were to be the first representative leaders: therefore in the first group of Parables, each one, such as the Sower, the Tares among the Wheat, the Mustard Seed, etc., characterizes certain practical sides of the gospel work; while in the latter group, such as the trio of Parables, called forth by the complaints of the Pharisees because Christ associated with sinners (Luke 15, 2), viz., the Lost Sheep, the Lost Penny, and the Prodigal Son (Luke 15, 3-32), all illustrate the different spirit that char-

acterizes their message, namely, the joy over the repentance of a sinner (vs. 7, vs. 10, vs. 32), over against the spiritual pride of the Pharisees. Again the Parable of the Unjust Steward (Luke 16, 1-13) is to illustrate this loss of the leadership in the Church to the Jewish hierarchy, whose skillful use of their waning authority and power in their own sphere is commended for imitation to the disciples in using similar earthly advantages in their higher spiritual sphere.

When it is stated that the purpose of the Parables is to withhold the mysteries of the Kingdom of God from others than the disciples, this can mean only that Christ is no longer willing to cast the pearls of the Gospel before the swine, who have shown that they do not appreciate these, and that He has determined to withdraw His grace from His contemporaries, whether temporally or permanently is not stated. In the second group of Parables this purpose is not so apparent, because at least in one case it is reported that the Pharisees plainly understood that they were meant, namely, in the story of the Wicked Husbandmen (Matt. 21, 45; Mark 12, 12; Luke 20, 19); which parable was really only an enlargement of one phase plainly taught just before in Matt. 21, 28, 32.

Under these circumstances it is only natural that the one common theme of all the Parables is missionary in character, and specifically those phases of the mission theme which were of concern primarily for the Apostles, but which may not have the practical interest for us now. Thus the theme of several Parables, notably the Unjust Steward, which tell the disciples that the stewardship of the affairs of the Kingdom of God is to be taken from those who then and there held it, a truth of

the deepest significance for them and already clearly and without figure declared in connection with the story of the Centurion and his faith (Matt. 8, 11-12), has now long since become one of the greatest facts of church history. The contents of the Parables are accordingly only to a limited degree doctrinal; and even where they are such as in the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican the purpose evidently is chiefly to warn against the former. It is a noteworthy fact that the two sections of the gospels which Christ spoke primarily for His disciples and their immediate need, namely, the Sermon on the Mount and the Parables, contain only meagerly the central facts of His gospel itself; but this can readily be explained by the specific purpose of these two groups of instruction.

In the interpretation of a Parable the first and chief purpose is to discover its scope or purpose, i. e., the spiritual lesson which it is intended to teach. Sometimes, as in Luke 18, 1 and 9, this is explicitly announced by Christ Himself. Sometimes it must be sought for from the occasion that induced Christ to declare this Parable, as was seen in the case of the group containing the Prodigal Son. The Parable of the Penny (Matt. 20, 1-16) was occasioned by the question of Peter (Matt. 19, 27) who reminds the Lord that they had done the very thing which the rich young man (Matt. 19, 16-30) had failed to do and had sacrificed everything for Christ, and now asks what will be their reward. In reply Christ first tells them (Matt. 19, 27-30) that in the church triumphant they shall be especially rewarded in accordance with the sacrifice they have made in the church militant, in harmony with the general teachings of the Scriptures that there shall be a difference in the reward

of the believers as there shall be in the punishment of the wicked; but, in contrast to this (the γάρ in Matt. 20, 1 gives the reason for the implied thought that there is also a sphere in which this inequality does not apply), He states that in the church on earth each one is to receive only his penny, no matter how long or hard he may have labored in the cause of Christ, i. e., here on earth the gifts of grace, the preaching of the word, the Sacraments, the forgiveness of sins, etc., are given equally to all, it being no matter whether Christians have all their lives been active, or only became such on their deathbed.

In some cases the surroundings of a Parable give practically no hint as to its special purpose as Matt. 21, 33 sqq.; Matt. 22, 1 sqq. In this case the exegete is entirely dependent on the contents in searching for the scope.

Christ interprets but two of His parables, namely, the Sower and the Seed, and the Tares among the Wheat in the first group. His example justifies the rule that in the interpretation of the Parables we are not compelled spiritually to apply each and every statement in the Parable, for He too fails to utilize some of the details, as, e. g., there were four kinds of land upon which the seed was sown, and that the enemy sowed the tares by night. It is common in Hermeneutics to distinguish the soul (anima) and the body (corpus) of a Parable; or to use kindred terms, between the marrow (medulla) and the bark (cortex), the former constituting that part of the Parable which is to be applied spiritually, the latter, that part which belonging only to the story as such, is to be ignored. Thus we distinguish between the substance and the ornamentation of a Par-

able. Just what feature of the story is to be spiritually interpreted may at times be a matter of dispute. Certainly not to be included are those features which are in themselves reprehensible, as is the sinful conduct of the Unjust Steward, or the motive of the Wicked Judge, who listens to the Importunate Widow only because of his convenience and comfort (Luke 18, 3), or of the man who hides the treasure he found in another man's field (Matt. 13, 44). It is perhaps a safe rule to say that all of those features and details which illustrate any part of the scope or special purpose of a Parable belong to the substance and should be applied; what is not thus connected logically with this scope or purpose can be discarded; but even in this case there may be a matter of doubt as to the exact features to be thus applied. The Parable, like all other figurative language, has a significance only in so far as the *tertium comparationis* goes, and this, as far as the interpretation goes, is frequently a matter of more or less uncertainty and justifies the rule of our old theologians *"Theologia parabolica non est argumentativa,"* i. e. no theological deductions are to be drawn from Parables alone. The fact of the matter is that Parables, like figurative language in general, are able to illustrate or *illumine* old truths but not to impart truth entirely new. This fact explains why Christ could say that His illiterate disciples could be further instructed by the Parables while the educated Scribes would only be confused by them (Matt. 11, 13); since the disciples had at least an elementary conception of the truths which the Parables were to illustrate, while the learned representatives of the hierarchy did not have this basis for the understanding of Christ's story pictures; what He says here is psychologically and pedagogically entirely correct. Here too He was a model teacher.

CHAPTER VII

Old Testament Passages Quoted in the New Testament

The citations found in the New Testament from the Old constitute a distinct exegetical and hermeneutical problem by themselves and are a recognized *crux*. The trouble is found in two features, namely, in the exceptionally free way in which these citations are given, there being practically not one that is found *verbatim et literatim;* and, secondly, in this that a number of these are seemingly employed in a sense by the New Testament writers entirely foreign to their original sense and purpose in the Old.

It is practically impossible to state exactly how many citations there are in the New Testament taken from the Old. In not a few cases the latter reproduces the exact thought and words of the former without stating that it is a citation. Thus in the hymn of Mary (Luke 1, 53), "He hath filled the hungry with good things," she has used almost the very words of Ps. 107, 9 (Ps. 34, 11). Again in I. Pet. 3, 14-15 the Apostle substantially adopts the language of Is. 8, 12-13, but in neither case is it said that this is a quotation. Taking in all the instances in which the expression of the Old Testament has evidently influenced the thoughts and the forms of New Testament utterances, including the real citations, it has been computed that a number exceeding six hundred can be made out. Of

direct quotations, not counting those that are repeatedly cited either in one book or in different books, there are generally computed to be one hundred and thirty-six in all.

The fact that these citations are often rendered very freely need not cause surprise. Attention has already been called to the fact that the Biblical writers seem to delight in varying their forms of expression. The Ten Commandments are not found in Exodus as they are in Deuteronomy; the duplicates in the Old Testament differ in every case; the two recensions of the Sermon on the Mount where they are parallels vary in form and the same is true of the Lord's Prayer; even the superscription on the cross appears in four different readings. A possible explanation of this phenomenon can be found in the fact that the Jews in the New Testament period were not accustomed to use the Hebrew Bible, but the Aramaic Targumin, which were often very free paraphrases and not translations. A direct citation or quotation was evidently a rare exception in those times, as is indicated too by the fact that in the New Testament the direct and the indirect discourse are not infrequently found combined in the same sentence.

In general it can be said that the forms of the New Testament quotations from the Old are based on the Septuagint translation. In this respect these citations can be divided into four classes: 1) Those in which the Greek corresponds exactly with the Hebrew; 2) Those in which it substantially agrees with the Hebrew, the differences being only in minor details and not changing the sense; 3) Those in which the Septuagint is followed, though it diverges to some extent

from the Hebrew; 4) Those in which neither the Hebrew nor the Septuagint is exactly adhered to. There are 72 passages that can be included in the first class, 30 in the second, 17 in the third and 17 in the fourth; so that more than one-half render the original very faithfully, though occasionally by an independent translation.

In order to give some idea of this condition the Old Testament quotations found in Matthew are here given:

Matt. 1,22-23 (Is. 7, 14) — the deviation from the original is very slight.

Matt. 2, 5-6 (Mic. 5, 2) — the difference is quite considerable both from the Hebrew and the Septuagint, but materially the passages agree, though not formally.

Matt. 2, 15 (Hos. 11, 1) — exact agreement.

Matt. 2, 18 (Jer. 31, 15) — the departures from the Hebrew are rather slight.

Matt. 2, 23 — for this remarkable passage there is no Old Testament source, the thought being apparently based on such passages as Is. 4, 2; 11, 1; Jer. 23, 1; Zech. 3, 8; 4, 12. Possibly a play on the word "Nezer."

Matt. 3, 3 (Is. 46, 3) — is taken directly from the Septuagint, differing slightly from the Hebrew.

Matt. 4, 6 (Ps. 91, 11-12) — the meaning of the original given in the words of the Septuagint.

Matt. 4, 7 (Deut. 6, 16) — practically an exact translation.

Matt. 4, 10 (Deut. 6, 13) — the words of the Septuagint.

Matt. 4, 14-16 (Is. 9, 1-2) — considerably abbreviated in the New Testament.

Matt. 8, 17 (Is. 53,4) — departs considerably from the Septuagint but adheres to the Hebrew.

Matt. 9, 12 (12, 7) (Hos. 6, 6) — gives the literal meaning of the original in the form of the Septuagint.

Matt. 11, 10 (Mal. 3, 1) — somewhat changed but for the sake of explanation.

Matt. 12, 17-21 (Is. 42, 1-4) — only the latter part does not adhere strictly to the original.

Matt. 13, 14-15 (Is. 6, 9-10) — differs only slightly from Hebrew but follows Septuagint.

Matt. 13, 35 (Ps. 78, 2) — practically the same as the Hebrew.

Matt. 15, 4 (Ex. 20, 12 and 21, 16) — substantially after Hebrew.

Matt. 15, 8-9 (Is. 29, 13) — the words of the Septuagint, differing slightly from the original.

Matt. 19, 4-5 (Gen. 2, 24) — the Septuagint is here followed but substantially the same as Hebrew.

Matt. 19, 18-19 (Ex. 20, 12-13; Lev. 19, 18) — after Hebrew.

Matt. 21, 4-5 (Zech. 9, 9) — differs chiefly in form from original.

Matt. 21, 13 (Is. 55, 1; Jer. 7, 11) — the first part is a literal translation.

Matt. 21, 16 (Ps. 8, 2) — a transcript of the Septuagint.

Matt. 21, 42 (Ps. 118, 22-23) — the Septuagint is followed verbatim.

Matt. 22, 24 (Deut. 25, 5) — possibly not a quotation, but merely professing to give the substance of a provision in the Mosaic law.

Matt. 22, 31-32 (Ex. 3, 6) — closely follows Hebrew as does Septuagint.

Matt. 22, 37 (Deut. 6, 5) — keeps closer to the Hebrew than does the Septuagint.

Matt. 22, 39 (Lev. 19, 18) — exact translation.

Matt. 22, 43-44 (Ps. 110, 1) — exact translation.

Matt. 26, 31 (Zech. 8, 7) — nearer to the Hebrew than to the Septuagint.

Matt. 27, 9-10 (Zech. 11, 13) — particularly difficult because the passage ascribes to Jeremiah what is actually found in Zechariah's prophecy, was taken from an older prophecy of Jeremiah, now no longer extant, so that this would be another example of a late prophet quoting one older. This too perhaps explains the rather noteworthy differences between the original Hebrew and the Evangelist's version.

Matt. 27, 46 (Ps. 22, 1) — the original is given exactly in the Septuagint here reproduced.

Of the difficulties presented by some of these passages, because used in a manner not in harmony apparently with the original utterances, mention has already been made above when speaking of the Sense of the Authors, and what has been said there will apply to similar cases. In more than one case, notably such as Is. 7, 14, only the conviction that the same Spirit who inspired the original prophet to make these utterances in the Old Testament also inspired the use of these prophecies in the New Testament, can give a satisfactory basis for the conviction that this was perfectly correct. In other words, the fundamental principle that the Scriptures must interpret Scripture, must furnish the Bible student with the certainty that the source of these exceptionally difficult passages really were intended to mean what the New Testament declares that they do, since in these days the ordinary rules of rhet-

oric and canon of literary interpretation fail him. Here it is his characteristic duty to take captive reason under faith, although, as is seen by a reference to the scholarly conservative commentaries, many and indeed most of the difficulties found in adjusting the New Testament quotations to their Old Testament originals readily yield to a fairminded critical investigation.

OUTLINES OF BIBLICAL HERMENEUTICS.

By Prof. GEO. H. SCHODDE, Ph. D., Capital University.

This treatise aims to discuss chiefly the teachings of the Bible itself as to its character, purpose and interpretation. Its chief contents are 1) The Bible as the object of Interpretation; 2) General Hermeneutics; 3) Special Hermeneutics.

Cloth, gilt markings, 200 pages---------- $1.50

BIBLICAL DOGMATICS.

By Prof. ANDREW G. VOIGT, D. D., LL. D., Columbia, South Carolina.

Concerning this book the publisher writes: We are enthusiastic about this book of Dr. Voigt's, whose treatment is both clear and scholarly. While it is more technical than popular, technical theological terms have been avoided or explained, and the book can really if not readily be understood by the common people." The author is known as a successful teacher in the Lutheran Church, and having been an untiring reader of German as well as English literature, his work represents, in brief form, the results of matured thinking in the field of Dogmatics.

Cloth, 250 pages. Price---------- $1.00

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN.

COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Lutheran Seminary Text Book Series.

INTRODUCTION TO LUTHERAN SYMBOLICS.

By Prof. J. L. NEVE, D. D., Springfield, Ohio.

This book offers an historical introduction to the Oecumenical and Particular Creeds of Lutheranism, a Synopsis of their contents, and an interpretation of their theology on the basis of the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession. Prof. Geo. J. Fritschel, D. D., has furnished the Synopsis of the Apology, Smalcald Articles and Large Catechism, and has also contributed the chapter on the Formula of Concord. The Section containing the interpretation of the Doctrinal Articles of the Augustana, which covers pages 100-292, will be welcomed as a further expansion of the subjects treated in the author's little book "The Augsburg Confession".

Cloth, gilt markings, 450 pages, price--- $1.75

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA.

By Prof. J. L. NEVE, D. D., Springfield, Ohio.

This is a work which was first published in 1903 as a little volume of 200 pages, and was introduced as a text-book in almost all Lutheran Seminaries of this country. In this second edition all historical matter has been brought up to date, and with the co-operation of representatives of the different Lutheran bodies the endeavor has been made to produce an objective history of Lutheranism in America. Special features of this edition are (1) a detailed history of the developments leading up to the break in Fort Wayne, (2) a reliable history of the Scandinavian bodies, prepared under the supervision of their own men.

To be had both in the German and the English language.

Cloth, gilt markings, 469 pages, price--- $1.75

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN.

COLUMBUS, OHIO.

APOLOGETICS OR A SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE.

By Prof. C. E. LINDBERG, D. D., LL. D., Rock Island, Ill.

This is the work of an able Lutheran theologian who offers us a text-book that has grown out of his experience in the class room. It touches upon the main apologetical topics, to be further developed by the teacher. Some parts have a fuller treatment for the purpose of satisfying the inquiring layman who has been kept in mind by the author. The book begins with a brief history of Apologetics. Then the usual theological and Biblical (including the anthropological, soteriological and Christological) questions are introduced, to be followed by the evidence of Christian experience and the eschatological questions.

Cloth, 250 pages. Price..... $2.00

IN PREPARATION.

Among the Lutheran Seminary Text-Books which are in preparation and which will likely leave the press in 1917 is a work on Catechetics and one on Homiletics by Dr. M. Reu whose splendid scholarship and eminent success as instructor in these branches fits him especially for the task assigned him.

Also "Introduction to the New Testament" by Prof. A. G. Tressler, Ph. D., D. D., Wittenberg Seminary, Springfield, Ohio.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN.

COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Lutheran
WCAU

William Carey Int'l University
3 1539 0010822